JUSTIFICATION

Onely upon A

SATISFACTION:

OR,

The Necessity and Verity of the Satisfaction of CHRIST, as the alone ground of remission of sin, asserted & opened against the *Socinians*.

Together with an APPENDIX in vindication of a Sermon preached on *Heb.* 2. 10. from the exceptions of *H. W.* in a Pamphlet called, *The freeness of Gods grace in the forgiveness of Sins by* Jesus Christ.

By *Robert Ferguson*.

Isa. 53. 6 *The Lord laid on him the iniquity of us all*, Heb. *He made the iniquity of us all to meet on him.*

7. *He was oppressed and he was afflicted*, Heb. *It was exacted, and he answered.*

2 Cor. 5. 21 *He hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.*

Gal. 3 13. *Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us.*

LONDON, Printed for D. *Newman*, at the Chirurgeons Arms near the Hospital in *Little Britain*, 1668.

1668

JUSTIFICATION

Only upon A

SATISFACTION:

OR,

The Necessity and Verity of the Satisfaction of CHRIST, as the alone ground of remission of sin, asserted, & opened against the *Socinians*.

Together with an APPENDIX in vindication of a Sermon preached on *Heb.* 2. 10. from the exceptions of *H. W.* in a Pamphlet called, *The freeness of Gods grace in the forgiveness of Sins by* Jesus Christ.

By *Robert Fergusson.*

Isa. 53. 6 *The Lord laid on him the iniquity of us all,* Heb. *He made the iniquity of us all to meet on him.*
7. *He was oppressed and he was afflicted,* Heb. *It was exacted, and he answered.*
2 Cor. 5. 21 *He hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.*
Gal. 3 13. *Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us.*

LONDON, Printed for *D. Newman,* at the Chirurgeons Arms near the Hospital in *Little Britain,* 1668.

1668

To every Chriſtian judicious Reader, who is tender of the Honour of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the Faith delivered to the Saints.

READER, There are ſeveral things which I deſire to beſpeak thee, which it is not fit, both in reſpect of thy ſelf and the Truth, that thou ſhouldſt be ignorant of.

1. The Doctrine here aſſerted, is one of the moſt important in the whole *Goſpel:*

for though all in the Scrip
ture be true, yet every thin
is not alike weighty, nor a
like neceſſary either to b
known or believed. Ther
are ſome Truths which w
are bound onely to believe
in caſe we know them to b
revealed; there are other
neceſſary to be believed an
known in order to our being
ſaved. The firſt depend
onely upon Gods veracity
that he cannot deceive us i
any thing he makes known
The ſecond upon the neceſ-
ſary connexion which God
hath eſtabliſhed betwixt
ſuch a Doctrine and ſuch a
End; ſo that happineſs is not

to

o be arrived at, but through
he knowledg and belief of
uch a Truth: ſo that there
ure *ignorance* or *neſcience* is
damning; whereas it is at
noſt but damnable to err in
he other, in caſe there have
een ſufficient means and
pportunities of conviction.
ome Errors do only ſcratch
he face, others ſtab the very
eart of the *Chriſtian Reli-*
ion; ſome do onely deface
he *Building*, others over-
hrow the *foundation*. There
re ſome miſtakes of well
eaning men, *Rom.* 15. 1.
nd every error is not incon-
iſtent with *ſalvation*, 1 *Cor.*
3. 12. neither are we upon

all differences to renounce mutual communion, *Phil.* 4. 15. But then there are also *Doctrines of Devils*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 1. *Which whosoever continues to profess, are to be rejected, Tit.* 3. 10. *Neither are we to bid such, God speed,* 2 *Joh. v.* 10. Now if there be any Doctrines in the world of this quality, that here disputed against, with some others of the like complexion held by the *Socinians*, are.

2. The Truth here established, is a Doctrine which the Churches of God have been in all ages in the possession of; not but that some

ſome men have gainſaid, but they have been ſtill upon ſo doing diſclaimed for *Hereticks*. The riſe of this abomination of denying the ſatisfaction of Chriſt, is charged upon the *Pelagians*, which being afterwards cheriſhed by one *Abailardus*, was at laſt fully ripened by *Servetus* and *Socinus*, &c. men whoſe names have been juſtly accounted hateful, by all to whom the glory of *Jeſus Chriſt* hath been dear.

3. The denial of the ſatisfaction of *Jeſus Chriſt* is but one part of the Gentlemens Divinity; the denial of the

Deity of *Jesus Christ*, and of the *Holy Ghost*, with several Opinions of the like tincture, make up their *Creed*: That *Socinianism* is but a kind of *Turcism*, is proved by *several*; see *Hotting. Hist. Orient. lib.* 3. *c.* 3. And that they are not *Christians*, however they mistile themselves so, is demonstrated by others; see *Hoornb. apparat. ad Controvers. Socin. p.* 73. &c.

4. This is not the first attempt they have made in this *City* and *Nation*, to overthrow the *Faith* of the Saints; one *Biddle* went before them, some years ago,

in the ſame undertaking; & how much ſoever by ſome thoſe times are branded for *heretical*, *wilde*, and *licentious*, yet it is well known what entertainment the *perſons* who then *governed* gave both the man and his doctrine, for beſides the burning of his book, and the impriſoning of himſelf, they appointed a learned *perſon* to refute him, whoſe labours in that affair have been admirably uſeful. What countenance or ſucceſs they have of late had, and to what number they are encreaſed, is fitter to bewail than to recount. However I cannot

but

but ſay that I was greatly ſurpriſed to hear that ſuch a Pamphlet ſhould be Licenſed: Miſtake me not Reader, as if I were poſitive in it, for I ſhould rather think that ſuppoſing ſome of the Chaplains were not under the reſtraint of their conſcience, yet that they ſhould conſult more the favour and credit of their Maſters, than dare to do ſuch a thing; but I leave this to be inſpected and debated by others: onely I muſt ſay that he behoves to have firſt, renounced the 39. Articles, and the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, whoever

ever either in this, or in any other point befriends the *Socinians*; and I am ready to believe that ſhould any of them ariſe to the ſupport of that abomination, if others ſhould be ſilent, yet the learned Dr. *Gunning* would take notice of them, having ſo worthily the laſt Commencement declared himſelf in oppoſition to the whole body of the *Socinians*.

5. It is fit thou ſhouldeſt know, that they boaſt of giving a ſpeedy Anſwer, and ſeveral have been named as ready for that undertaking; we have had a taſte of the ſtrength of one of them already

ready, *in his whole Christ a meer creature*; and seeing he abides still in that perswasion, he may do well to vindicate it from the confutation of Mr. *Eaton*. If his friends do not belye him, he is about publishing a Commentary on the 53. Chap of *Isaiah*, to discharge Christ from being meant or intended in all or any part of that Chapter. I suppose it will hardly receive the favour (though it be in a certain persons hand to that purpose) to come abroad *cum permissu*; but when or however it comes, there will not be those wanting to refute it. They talk high

high of a Forraigner who is lately come over, but if he find himſelf *par negotio*, he had beſt attempt the vindication of his *Father*, either his book *de uno Deo*, from *Placæus*, or his book *de ſatisfactione*, from *Eſſenius*. I do not carve them out work elſewhere, to avoid being fallen upon my ſelf, but to ſhow that what they bring freſh upon the ſtage, hath been again and again refuted, without the leaſt attempt of a reply. I confeſs at the rate they confuted my Sermon, they may ſoon anſwer the preſent book, and a hundred more of this nature, and if they take that courſe, the world will not think me nor any other obliged to *rejoin*; but if they ſhall think fit to do it methodically, and κατὰ πόδας, they ſhall be attended to: though the doctrine would not be the leſs true, ſhould I fail in the defence of it.

6. The occaſion of the Sermon which

which hath proved the rise of this debate, was meerly a regard to the honour of our Lord Jesus Christ and the faith delivered to the Saints, which as I was informed, begun both clandestinely and openly to be undermined and assaulted; and I find now that I was not mistaken in my information. The way of managing it on my part, I hope both first and last hath been such as becomes a Preacher of the Gospel. If any think it a trespass that I preached, I must leave it to them who have power, to act as they see good.

7. If any should be offended at my asserting the absolute necessity of a satisfaction, on supposition of God's saving sinners; I must tell them, but without reflecting upon those who refound a satisfaction upon the alone pleasure and wisdome of God; that those who have managed this truth most advanta-

vantagiously have taken the same method. Scholars may consult *Essenius*, *Voetius*, *Hoornbeck*, *Amyraldus*, Dr. *Owen*, and of late *Turretinus*.

8. I know not whether the Adversaries will vouchsafe to read over what I have written, but if they do that, yet I know the nature of the men too well, and their prepossessions to expect that they should be the better, the confession of *Socinus* bars me from all belief of reclaiming men of that kidney. For thus he writes speaking of satisfaction, *Ego quidem, etiamsi non semel, sed sæpe id in sacris monimentis scriptum extaret: non idcirco tamen ita rem prorsus me habere crederem, ut vos opinamini*, de Servat. l. 3. c. 6. But I hope I may desire of others that they would seriously peruse what is here tendred; do not look upon these things, as things at a distance wherein

wherein you are not concerned; and be ſure to improve the belief of theſe doctrines to a Goſpel ſtrictneſs, otherwiſe your being *orthodox* ſets you never the more out of eternal danger: but if you will be faithful in this, I then refer you to *John* 7. 17. *If any man will do his will, he ſhall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I ſpeak of my ſelf.* That the Lord would give the much of the *anointing*, and thereby lead the into, and eſtabliſh the in the truth, is the prayer of him who deſires according to his truſt and gift to approve himſelf.

The Servant of Chriſt

to thy advantage.

R. F.

CHAP. I.

In what ſenſe to juſtifie and juſtification are to be taken and underſtood in this affair.

TO juſtifie, is either taken in a moral ſenſe, or in a judicial, for the working a change in a mans perſon, or the making a change in his eſtate. By the firſt, he is made a new creature: By the ſecond, he is abſolved at the Bar of Juſtice. The Papiſts contend wholly for the firſt ſenſe; namely, that juſtification ought to be taken for the infuſion of holineſs, and the Reformed for the ſecond, *viz.* the diſcharging and abſolving one in Law;

I will not inſiſt on the words צדיק, הרק, δικαιόω, δικαίωμα δικαιοσύνη δικαίωσις, jus, juſtitia, juſtificare.

Now that this, and not the former must be the meaning and ſenſe of the Holy Ghoſt in this affair, appears,

Voces quibus utitur Sp. S. nullibi in tota Scripturâ, infuſâ juſtitiâ juſtũ facere, notant. nec apud probatos latinitatis Authores, hoc ſenſu uſurpantur.

1. Becauſe otherwiſe we ſhould confound juſtification, and ſanctification, which the Scripture every where diſtinguiſheth, 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. *But ye are ſanctified, but ye are juſtified*, Rom. 8. 29, 30. *whom he called*, (namely, to a conformity to the image of his Son) *them he alſo juſtified*. 1. In ſanctification, the change is abſolute and inherent; in juſtification, relative and juridical, 2. Sanctification is graduall and ſucceſſive, juſtification is inſtantaneous, and compleat at once. 3. By the firſt we are made like God, by the ſecond we are taken into the favour of God. 4. Sanctification is the ſubduing the dominion and power of ſin in us. Juſtification is the removing the obnoxiouſneſs to the curſe which was againſt us. Though

theſe

theſe two in the caſe we ſpeak of be ever *united*, yet they are not to be *confounded*. They *differ* as to the *prædicate*, though they be not *ſeparate* as to the *ſubject*; though where the *one* is, there the *other* be alſo, yet the *one* is not *formally* the *other*. In many other caſes they are ſeparable, one may be *morally juſt*, and yet not *juridically juſtified*; as Chriſt, who though he was every way *Innocent*, *Pilate* himſelf being Judge, *Joh.* 18.38. *Joh.* 19. 4 6. yet he *was condemned*; and on the other hand one may be morally unjuſt, and yet judicially acquitted, daily experience bearing witneſs: however in all caſes they are diſtinct. But to ſay the truth, the Papiſts acknowledge no pardon of ſin diſtinct from ſanctification, for though they ſpeak of remiſſion, yet they always underſtand it by renovation, which is a ſtumbling at the very threſhold, and an argument of

their little inſight into this myſtery of God.

2. Becauſe the Apoſtle, who ſo often uſeth the word, never uſeth it for the *Infuſion of holineſs*, but for a *judicial abſolution*, and therefore oppoſeth it not to *pollution and defilement*, but to *accuſation and condemnation*, Rom. 5. 18. As by the offence of one judgment came upon all to *condemnation*, even ſo by the righteouſneſs of one, the freegift came upon all men *unto juſtification* of life, *Rom.* 8. 33, 34. It is God that *juſtifieth*, who is he that *condemneth*. And accordingly he deſcribeth it by *remeſſion of ſin*, not by *renovation of nature*, *Rom.* 4. 7. and by *Imputation* of righteouſneſs without us, to us, not by an *Infuſion* of holineſs, or working of grace in us, *Rom.* 4. 6.

3. Becauſe the queſtion betwixt the Jews and the Apoſtle, was not whether we *were renewed* in our ſouls by the works of the Law,

Law, or by Faith, but by which of them we were *acquitted* at the Bar of God. This is clear throughout the whole diſpute.

The word then is to be taken in a judicial legal ſenſe, and ſo is oppoſed to condemn; now in this ſenſe it is uſed two ways in Scripture.

1. For the *declaring* of one juſt, 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. *juſtified* in the ſpirit the Son of God, having aſſumed our nature, being made of a woman, *Gal.* 4. 4. taking fleſh and bloud, *Heb.* 2. 14. and manifeſting himſelf in the fleſh, he was judged by the world, not onely to be a meer man, but condemned as an Impoſtor and Malefactor; now he was juſtified in the ſpirit, that is, in and by the ſpirit; He was not only vindicated, and proclaimed innocent from all the accuſations of his enemies, but withal approved and declared to be the true and the great God; partly by the

Juſtum judicare, vid. Mat. 11. 19. *Mat.* 12. 37. *Luc* 7. 29 & 16. 15.

atteſtation of the Holy Ghoſt, in viſible deſcent on him at baptiſm, *Mat.* 3. laſt, partly by audible voice both then, and at other times, *Mat.* 17. 5. *Joh.* 12. 28, 29. partly by the teſtimony of miracles, which he wrought by the ſpirit, *Heb.* 2. 4. *Act.* 2. 22. partly by that great teſtimony of raiſing himſelf from the dead, through the eternal ſpirit, *Rom.* 1. 4. *Act.* 13. 33. 1 *Pet.* 3. 18. partly by the teſtimony of the Prophets and Apoſtles, who as they ſpake by the inſpiration of the ſpirit, 2 *Pet.* 1. 21. *Joh.* 16. 13. So they bare witneſs to the divinity and Godhead of Chriſt. This alſo is the import of the word, *Jam.* 2. 21. was not *Abraham* our father *juſtified* by works, i. e. *declared to be juſt*; by the offering of *Iſaac*, *Abraham* teſtified his faith to be true and right, *Gen* 22. 12. by this I know that thou feareſt me, upon which God reneweth unto him

the

the promiſe, as a *teſtimony and declaration* that he was juſtified.

2. But moſt properly, and alſo moſt frequently, it is made uſe of to ſignifie to *abſolve and acquit in* judgment; *Act.* 13. 29. by him all that believe *are juſtified* from all things, from which he could not be *juſtified* by the law of *Moſes*, Rom. 2. 13. not the hearers of the law are *juſt* before God, but the doers of the law ſhall be *juſtified*, *Rom.* 3. 20. by the deeds of the law ſhall no fleſh be *juſtified* in his ſight, ſee *Rom.* 5. 16, 17. 1 *Cor.* 4. 4. *Gal.* 12. 16, 17. Now this is the ſenſe we are to underſtand the words in, in this affair, to diſcharge by *accounting righteous in law.*

Juſtum judicare, vid Deut. 25. 1. *pſ.* 143. 2 *Rom.* 8. 33, 34.

CHAP. II.

Somethings proposed in general, towards the better clearing the common notion of justification. Justication is an act of justice. Onely just men can be justly justified. Those who are once unjust cannot be acquitted as just without a satisfaction. No necessity that satisfaction be made in kind, or that it be made by the party offending. May be made by doing, or suffering, or both.

HAving established the sense of the words, that in the affair before us we are alone to take them in a judicial sense; some things are to be offered in the next place for the rendring more easie and clear the common notion of our justification.

1. Justification is an act of justice, and not of mercy, *Rom.* 3. 26. To declare his *righteousness*, that he might be *just*, and the *justifier* of them which believe in Jesus.

This

This is the difference betwixt *forgiveneſs* and *juſtification*, that the firſt is an act of *mercy*, the latter an act of *juſtice*. The word juſtifie is a judicial word, and in all Courts of Judicature, proceedings ought to be according to *right*, and not according to *favour*; and ſentence ſhould not be according to *mercy*, but *law*; *grace*, but *equity*, Exod. 23. 2, 3, 6.

2. None but *juſt men* can be *juſtly juſtified*; a man muſt be juſt, or made juſt before he can be juſtly juſtified, *Deut.* 25. 1. If there be a controverſie between men, and they come unto judgment, that the Judges may judge them, then they ſhall *juſtifie the righteous* and *condemn the wicked*. There is a wo denounced againſt him that ſhall *juſtifie* the *wicked*, Iſa. 5. 23. *Solomon* tells us, that he who *juſtifies the wicked*, is as much an abomination to the Lord as he that *condemns the juſt*, Prov. 17.

17. 15. Not but that it is lawful ſometimes for a Prince or others to *pardon* an offendor, but without calling good evil, which God denounceth a wo againſt, *Iſa.* 5. 20. An offendor cannot be juſtified. *Joſeph* pardoned his Brethren, but he could no ways juſtifie them: according to all lines and meaſures of juſtice, it is as criminal to *juſtifie the Nocent*, as to *condemn the Innocent*, Prov. 24. 24. He that ſaith to the *wicked*, thou art *righteous*, him ſhall the People curſe; and this not onely holds with reference to Men, but God, *Exod.* 34. 7. He will by no means *clear the guilty*, Mica. 6. 11. Shall I count them pure with the wicked ballances? There is a ſtrong negation in the queſtion, I cannot: To ſtrengthen this a little further, and render it more plain; we muſt diſtinguiſh between *pronouncing the ſentence* of guilt and death, and *the execution* of the ſentence:

tence: A priſoner may be found guilty and condemned, and yet not execute; foraſmuch as he may produce a pardon, or obtain a reprieve, but he can no ways be juſtified, and acquitted as not guilty. Thus God by *Nathan* pronouuced againſt *David* the ſentence of guilt, yet pardoned him as to the execution of it, *2 Sam.* 12. 7. 13. God neither did nor could pronounce him guiltleſs of the murder, *&c.* though he could and did remit the ſentence of death. That none but thoſe who are juſt or made juſt, can be juſtly juſtified, appears further here. (1.) Becauſe all Gods judgments are according to truth, *Rom.* 2. 2. but it were contrary to truth, to ſay to a man he is guiltleſs, when he is guilty. (2.) All God's judgments are according to juſtice, *Pſal.* 119. 75. But it were contrary to juſtice, to acquit and declare a man innocent, when he were nocent.

3. Poſſibly

Poſſibly it may be objected that God is ſaid to *juſtifie* the *ungodly*, Rom. 4. 5. and that therefore thoſe who are unjuſt, may be juſtly juſtified. *Anſw.* It is true, God juſtifies thoſe who are guilty of ſin, and doth juſtly in ſo doing, in that Chriſt hath made ſatisfaction for their ſin, and through faith they can plead an intereſt in it, ſo that it becomes theirs, and is accounted to them for righteouſneſs.

3. Thoſe that are once unjuſt, cannot be made juſt again, or acquitted as juſt, without a *compenſation and ſatisfaction* made *to the party injured for the offence*; whatſoever elſe can be thought of, or may be pleaded, is not enough for the *acquitting* of a perſon *as juſt*. We will briefly view all that is, or can be ſaid in the caſe.

(1.) Sorrow for the offence committed is not ſufficient, for the conſtituting of the offendor juſt

t: The Heathen ſaid, *Quem nitet peccaſſe, pænè eſt innocens*, almoſt innocent, but not altogether. The Law proceeds againſt Malefactour, be his ſorrow for s crime never ſo great: He that ſtains a wrong is not righted by s ſorrow that doth commit it. od himſelf proceeded againſt *vid*, for his ſin of numbring the ople, though *David* heartily ſorwed and repented for it, 2 *Sam.* 24. 10.

(2.) Confeſſion of the fault, is ground in Law for abſolution, more than repentance and ſorw; when a perſon ſtands arigned, his confeſſion of the fact th not at all tend to the acquitg him of guilt, but on the conry promotes his condemnati. And therefore when the Aſtle ſaith, if we confeſs, &c. *is juſt* to *forgive us* our ſins, *oh.* 1. 9. It is in reference to od's *promiſe*, but that which is

the

the ground of it with respect t
justice, is the bloud of Christ, *v.* 7

(3.) Remission and forgivene
doth not make a man that i
guilty to become guiltless; thoug
a Thief be pardoned, yet as t
guilt he is a Thief still; this i
only the *gratifying* of an offendo
not the *justifying* of him: this i
a meer Act of Grace, not an Ac
of Justice. Forgiveness can onl
release from the *penalty*, where
as justification releases from th
demerit.

(4) It is not the sustaining th
penalty that makes a man who i
unjust to become just; I know
there are many of another mind
but the ground of the mistake
apprehend to be this, that they d
not consider, that the end of th
Law, in all criminal matters, i
obedience, and that the penalty i
added for other ends; as to de
ter men from doing the like; *Deut*
13. 11. and 17. 13. and to diver
th

Hoc interest inter condonationem meram, & justificationē acquisitam; quod ibi pœna relaxatur, hic meritum pœnæ Gatak.

Remissio non justos, sed a pœna peccati liberos, statuit, Gomar.

Nemo prudens punit quia peccatum est, sed ne peccetur; revocari enim præterita non possunt, futura prohibeantur, Sen.

Hence punishments are called παραδείγματα.

he wrath of God; which if ſin
o unpuniſhed, is kindled not on-
y againſt the Offenders, but the
whole Land, *Deut.* 13. 15. 16, 17.
But the ſuſtaining the penalty ne-
ver makes a man that is unjuſt to
e juſt in Law. A Perjured per-
ſon, though he has loſt his ears,
et he is reputed a perjured per-
ſon ſtill, and if introduced into a
Court of Juſtice to take an Oath,
he will be rejected and refuſed, as
nworthy and uncapable in Law.
Though a Thief be Burn't in the
Hand, yet he is accounted a Thief
till: The ſuſtaining the penalty,
loth not ſave and make up the
wrong done to the party preju-
diced. If a Traitor take away the
life of the Supream Governour,
is undergoing the utmoſt tor-
ure cannot compenſate the
wronge he hath done the State.
However ſhould it be ſo in other
caſes, yet it is moſt certain, that
n the caſe we are to treate of, a

man

man that is unjuſt, cannot by undergoing the penalty be made juſt again: for to undergo the penalty of ſin, is to be ever damned, and never juſtified. So that it remains, if a man hath been once unjuſt, he can only be made juſt again by a ſatisfaction; and this is able to do it; for *plenary ſatisfaction* for a fault, and the *non commiſſion* of it, are of *equal juſtice*, if there be an equivalency and juſt value in that ſatisfaction that is made, to the honour of the party offended, and law that is broken, ſo that as much *benefit ariſeth* by the *ſatisfaction*, as there was *damage* by *the offence*, then the ſatisfaction is *full*, and juſtice it ſelf acquits that man.

Satisfacere, eſt tantum facere quantum ſatis eſt erato ad vindictam

Satisfactio pro ſolutione eſt, ſaith the Civil *Law*.

4. The fourth thing I would offer to be obſerved in general is this, that it is not needful that the ſatisfaction be always made in kind, but it is ſufficient if it be made in value. If a Beaſt be ſtollen,

ſatiſ-

ſatisfaction may be made by paying down as much money to the party wronged as he demands, as well as if the very Beaſt were reſtored. It was ordained in the Judicial Law, that if a man ſmote the eye of his ſervant, that it periſh'd, he ſhould let him go free for his eyes ſake, *Exod.* 21. 26. ſo that God himſelf being judge, the mans liberty was eſteemed *valuable ſatisfaction* for the loſs of his eye. *vid. etiam* Exod. 21. 18, 19, 32, 33.

5. I would propoſe this to be conſidered, that it is not always needful that the ſatisfaction be made by the *party offending*, but it may be made by *another*. If the Surety pay the Debt, it is all one to the Creditor as if he that contracted it, pay'd it. This univerſally holds in pecuniary matters; if the Debt be pay'd, the Law doth not enquire who paid it. But in criminal matters it is otherwiſe, there *noxa ſequitur caput*,

put, a Man hath dominion over his money, and in that respect, may in way of suretiship engage himself to pay another mans debt; but no man hath a dominion over himself, or his own life, and therefore may neither part with a member of his own in commutation for the member of another, nor lay down his own life, for the redemption of others. This doth admirably display the *Grace of God*, as well as *his Justice*, that though he would have his Law satisfied, yet he would allow commutation, where the rigour of the Law allowed none. And it also shews the full dominion that Christ had over his own life that he could part with it for the life of others.

So that there is both *Implicio & relaxatio, solutio debiti, & debiti condonatio.*

6. Let this be taken notice of that satisfaction may be made by *doing*, or *suffering*, or jointly by *both*: If a man owe a summ of money, and cannot pay his Cre-

dit

ditor in kind, he satisfies him if he does it in service; if he *works* as long *freely* for him, as the Creditor shall count *valuable* to the debt. If a Person having injured another should afterwards hazard his life for him, this might be deemed satisfaction for the former injury. Or one that is in debt to another, may pay him part in money, and part in service.

CHAP. III.

Somethings more particularly propos'd, towards the clearing of our justification. We must be charged. Must plead. Cannot plead not guilty, nor be justified upon the Plea of mercy for the sake of mercy. Nor upon the Plea of satisfaction made by our selves. Only upon the Plea of a satisfaction made by another.

WE must in order to being justified, be arraigned

and charged, otherwise, as on
well notes, If a man be pronoun
ced righteous, that was never e
dited, he is onely *praised*, not
fified. Now we all ſtand a
raigned and charged, *Joh.* 5. 4
*There is one that accuſeth you, eve
Moſes*, i. e. the Law of *Moſe*
This was one great reaſon wh
after we had loſt and darkned t
tranſcript of the Law which w
in our natures: God renewed t
Law by *Moſes*, *Gal.* 3. 19. *It w
added becauſe of tranſgreſſion.* N
only to curb and reſtrain from ſi
but to charge and accuſe for ſi
For as the Apoſtle ſays elſewhe
1 *Tim.* 1. 9. the Law is not for t
righteous, but the diſobedient,
e. it is not to accuſe and conde
the righteous, but only to acc
and threaten the diſobedient. W
ſtand all endited and charged
the Law, *Gal.* 3. 20. *By the L
is the knowledge of ſin.* We ſhou
not have known our ſelves ſo w

to be guilty, unless the Law had charged us with guilt, *Rom.* 7. 7. And that the charge is true, our own consciences come in for witnesses, *Rom.* 2. 15. we need none else to prove the Inditement, our own hearts giving testimony against us.

Meminerit deum se adhibere testem, edestut arbitror, mentem suam, Cic.

2. Being thus charged we must *Plead*, he that refuseth to Plead abandoneth himself to the Law. Now there are but two Pleas, that of *guilty*, and not *guilty*.

1. As I said before, we cannot plead *not guilty*, being under the impeachment of our own consciences, as well as of the Law. *Illo nocens se damnat quo peccat die.* This might have been the Plea of *Adam* before he fell, but of none else, 1. *King.* 8. 46. *There is no man that sinneth not*, Eccles. 7. 20. *There is not a just man upon earth that doth good and sinneth not.* Some understand it, that sinneth not in doing good, 1 *Joh.* 1. 8. *If*

Utut alios latere possis tute tibi conscim eris.

Mens quoque nemen habet.

we ſay, we have no ſin, we deceive our ſelves, and the truth is not in us, Prov. 20. 9. *Who can ſay, I have made my heart clean, I am pure from my ſin*, James 3. 2. *In many things we offend all.* In a word, all have ſinned, *Rom.* 3. 23. *All*, though not all *alike* ſee, *Rom.* 3. 9, 19. Whatever be the Plea of the Sons of Men, that cannot.

2. Our Plea then muſt be Guilty, and in this Caſe we muſt either *Plead mercy for the ſake of mercy, or mercy for the ſake of ſatisfaction.* There is no third.

1. There is no being juſtified upon the Plea of mercy, for the ſake of mercy. For as one well obſerves, it were not to *plead*, but to *beg*. Nor were it at all to be *juſtified*, but meerly to be *pardoned*, it were to be dealt with alone upon *the ſcore of grace*, not at all upon *the ſcore of righteouſneſs*; and we have already proved, that juſtification is an act of juſtice,

ſtice, and not of mercy. It is true, in the ſalvation of ſinners, both grace and juſtice meet; we are both *pardoned* and *juſtified*. God is as merciful as we can deſire, and yet as righteous as himſelf can deſire: There is the *freeſt Grace*, and the *fulleſt Juſtice*. As God pardons ſin, he diſplays his mercy; as he juſtifieth us from ſin, he manifeſteth his righteouſneſs. The ignorance of this is the πρῶτον ψεῦδος of a late Socinian Pamphlet, written in oppoſition to a Sermon, which was lately Preached in behalf of the ſatisfaction of Chriſt: That becauſe there is forgiveneſs, that therefore there is no juſtification; and becauſe God acts towards us in a way of mercy, that therefore he doth not alſo act towards us in a way of juſtice: As if God, for the advancing the honour of one *property* and *perfection of his Nature*, muſt Impeach and Eclipſe

all the reſt. But if the Author of that diſcourſe be as teachable as he is ignorant, he may once for all take notice, that the freeneſs of remiſſion doth not conſiſt in the want of a ſatisfaction, or in any defect in the ſatisfaction that is made; but in theſe four other things.

1. In that though he exact a ſatisfaction, he doth not exact it, at the hand of the *delinquent*. In the rigour of the Law, the Criminal himſelf ſhould bear the puniſhment: and here *ſi alius ſolvit, aliud ſolvitur*. Now is not this grace? that though he will have his juſtice ſatisfied, yet he will diſpenſe ſo far with the offendor, as not to demand *ſolution* from himſelf, but he will allow the *ſubſtitution* of a Surety to make the *ſatisfaction*, and take *ſatisfaction* for *ſolution*.

Solvere dicitur qui per ſe pretium numerat, fide facere qui quod alius debet ſolvit.

2. In that he both contrived the ſatisfaction, and gave his own Son

to

to make it. Supposing that he would have accepted a satisfaction, yet he might have left it to the offendor, to have found out the way and the means to have made it: whatever diminitive thoughts the Socinians may have of this, I am sure the Scripture every where delivers it as a fruit and result of inexpressible love; *Joh.* 2. 16. *Rom.* 5. 8. 1 *Joh.* 4. 9, 10. *In this was manifested the love of God towards us, because God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.* Was there no grace in Christ *his* Interposing for us, and not for Angels? was God under any obligation to fallen man, that he behoved to recover him more than fallen Angels? Might not God have honoured his justice in the damnation of both alike, and that without the least dero-

derogation to his mercy? was there no grace in translating our sins from us to Christ, *Isa.* 53. 6. and exacting full payment at his hand in our room, *Isa.* 53. 5, 10, 11? In a word, however these Socinian Gentlemen stile themselves Vindicaters of the Grace of God, as they wholly subvert his justice, and darken his holiness, they will also be found to any sober enquirer, greater eclipsers of his mercy, and derogators from his love and grace, than any of their adversaries.

3. It consists in a gracious acceptation of that satisfaction in our steads, for so *many*, and no *more*; for *such*, and not for *others*, he might have refused it for all, or accepted it for others, not for such. That the death and blood of Christ is of infinite worth, proceeds from the dignity of his person, and greatness of his sufferings; yet that it is a *ransome or*

satis-

satisfaction for many, and particularly for such, doth not immediately *arise from its sufficiency and worth*, but *from the intention and agreement of the Father and Son, using and accepting it to that end, and in* behalf of *such*. There is a value in the blood and satisfaction of Christ, to have purchased both grace and pardon for all mankind, if the Father and Son had so intended and pleased. Now that grace and life should be bought by it to some, and not others, as it is solely to be ascribed to the pleasure of the Father and Son, designing and using it to that purpose; so it is the effect and issue of high mercy and distinguishing love at leasure, see *Joh.* 17. 19. τελειῶσαι *significat se Deo in Sanctam victimam consecrare, vid.* Heb. 2. 10. *Heb.* 5. 9. *Eph.* 5. 2, 25. *Heb.* 10. 14. *Tit.* 2. 14. Is there no grace in this, that the death of Christ should be intend-

ed

ed and accepted as a ſatisfactio
in behalf of ſome, ſo that in du
time the Father, becauſe of that
ſhould beſtow grace upon, and b
reconciled to ſuch; others, in th
meane time, being left under th
power of their lufts and ſins, and
obnoxious to God's wrath and
enmity? Whatever apprehenſi-
ons that ſort of men have of it,
there are others who deſire to take
notice of, and admire it.

4. The freeneſs of God's grace
towards ſinners, ſtands in the free
and effectual application of the
death and ſatisfaction of Chriſt
to them; his free donation of the
ſpirit to ſome, to work faith in
them, and to bring them up to
the conditions, upon which the ſa-
tisfaction of Chriſt and pardon
through it is only pleadable. The
Father and Son having contrived
and brought about this ſatisfacti-
on, without any help or riſe from
us, *We could have no actual intereſt*

in

in the benefits of it, but upon ſuch termes as the Father and Son ſhould agree to. It is true, if we our ſelves had made the ſatisfaction, that then without the intervention of any new condition, both Law and Juſtice would have diſcharged us. But that being done by others, without any contrivance or influence of ours, the benefit of it is not to be expected by us, but upon ſuch conditions as thoſe who brought about and accompliſhed that work think fit to appoint. Now it having pleaſed the Father and the Son to conſtitute and appoint, believing as the condition upon which the ſatisfaction of Chriſt ſhould be accounted ours, and without which we ſhould have no intereſt in the benefit of it; and we being both unable and unwilling to believe, our *moral* impotency and inſufficiency to this, being no leſs than our *Phyſical* inability and incapacity was to

the

the former, *Joh.* 16. 44. 1 *Cor.* 2. 14. *Joh.* 6. 29. Is it not then eminent mercy and grace? that while the generality are left under their unwillingness, enmity, and inability; *God should in some work both to will and to do*, Phil. 2. 13. *Give them to believe*, Phil. 1. 29. *Ephes.* 2. 8. *Draw them to Christ*, Joh. 6. 44. *Fulfil the work of faith in them with power*, 2 Thes. 1. 11. Certainly whatever low imaginations some have of this, there are others will not cease to adore that distinguishing and eminent love and mercy which unfolds it self in it.

Having thus briefly shown wherein the Grace of God in the pardoning of sin consists; though he pardon none but with respect to, and upon the account of a satisfaction. I return to that which I was upon, namely, that to be justified upon the Plea of meer mercy, is both *perfect nonsense*, and a *formal contradiction*. Whatever these

these high masters of reason think of it, we poorer mortals use to account it nonsense, to say a man is justified, when he is meerly gratified, and according to our little Philosophy we esteem it a contradiction, to make that the *alone effect of mercy*, wherein *justice hath* only to do. And our adversary must give us leave to retort his own Phrase, with this little alteration upon himself, that he and his friends are absurd not only in their Faith, but in their Reason: As we are justified, God acts only towards us in way of righteousness; as we are pardoned, he acts only towards us in way of mercy. But as in *being saved*, we are both *pardoned* and *justified*, so in the *whole* of our *recovery*, there is a wonderful combination and union of mercy and justice.

Now though this were enough to overthrow our being justified upon the Plea of mercy, for the

ſake of mercy. I ſhall yet for the fuller clearing and eſtabliſhing the truth that we are diſcourſing, endeavour to prove, that as we have already ſaid, it is a contradiction to be juſtified upon the ſole terms of mercy and grace. So ſecondly, It was not poſſible for God in a way of *conſiſtency with his truth and juſtice*, to ſave ſinners and pardon ſin, but through the *intervention of a ſatisfaction*. And let this be noted once for all, that what God cannot do in *agreeableneſs to his truth and righteouſneſs*, he *cannot do at all*.

That it was not poſſible for God to pardon ſin and ſave ſinners without the intervention and conſideration of a ſatisfaction, may be demonſtrated, Firſt, From the truth of God's threatnings. Now for the better underſtanding the ſtrength of this Argument, and that exceptions and cavils may be obviated, I ſhall premiſe theſe things. Thoug

1. Though threatnings preciſely and univerſally taken, do only ſignifie what is due, not what ſhall actually be; yet foraſmuch as God in giving his creatures a law, intended not only to tell them that according to that they muſt *live*, but alſo that according to that they muſt be *judged*; therefore though in the *primary* ſenſe of all threatnings, the meaning only is, ſuch a penalty in caſe of offence ſhall be due; yet in that God ſignifieth he will govern according to his law. He *ſecondarily* declareth, that he will inflict the penalty, and give to all their due. As it was neceſſary that God in the enacting his law, ſhould annex a penalty, ſo in the promulgation of his law, he intended that the world ſhould believe he would execute the penalty in caſe his law were violate.

Loquuntur de debito, non de eventu.

Tacè permittitur, quod ſine ultione prohibetur, Tert.

2. There is a difference betwixt *particular threatnings* denounced

in some *singular cases, to some special ends*, & a *General comminatio*
or threatening *annexed to an universal law*; and however the first
sort may be relaxed or dispensed
with, *Isa.* 38. 1. with 5. *Jonas* 3. 4
with 10. yet the second is as unal-
terable as the law it self; because
without it the end of the law can-
not be compassed, though the end
of the law be not the inflicting of
the penalty, but obedience, yet
the annexing of the penalty to the
law is necessary to the enforcing of
obedience.

Qui ratione duci non possunt, metu continentur, Quint.

3. We must distinguish be-
twixt those *threatnings* which im-
port only *temporal punishment*
and those which denounce *eternal*
For suppose God doth suspend the
infliction of temporal judgments
yet this is no violation of the San-
ction of his law, forasmuch
what he forbears here, he may in-
flict in severer kind hereafter; but
on the other hand should he rela-

and dispense with those threatnings which denounce eternal judgments, no crime were possibly punishable according to its demerit, seeing all that creatures are capable of having inflicted on them in this life, is infinitely still below the desert of their least sin.

4. We ought heedfully to note the difference, betwixt *Evangelical threatnings* and *legal*: Evangelical I count those that form obligation to fatherly and Gospel chastisements; legal, such as denounce unmixed and unallayed curse and wrath. These two widely differ not only in their nature *but* [illegible]; the end of Gospel threatnings, is the *recovering us to, and the keeping of us within the bounds of Child-like obedience*, and therefore God hath not only signified, but the nature of the affair requires, that they should be executed only in case need be, 1 *Pet.*

This is it which Author's call *ὑπόδεσία, cum pœna infligitur emendandi causâ.*

6. Supposing then that the bu-

fineſs of theſe threatnings be done to the hand of God without the execution of them; it clearly follows, that the obligation of the believer to them, as they have reſpect to ſuch an end, diſſolves and ceaſeth. That which is God's intent by them, being obtained without them, the execution of them without the leaſt derogation to the truth of God, or impeachment of his other properties, may be ſuſpended. But legal threatnings being of another nature, and having another *end, namely, the vindication of God's holineſs and juſtice upon powers and rebels*, they are no way diſſolvable, but muſt neceſſarily be inflicted, that the perfection and government of God may be vindicated, and ſin may be revenged. All ſin is a contempt of God's authority and government, and caſts dirt upon his glory, and punishment is the vindicating of God's honour in the revenging of evil which is committed. On

This is that which Authors call τιμωρία, cum poena adhibetur animo ulciſcendi. Hoc intereſt inter caſtigationem & poenam, poena vindictæ rationem habet, caſtigatio verò habet rationem emendationis, Gamer.

let this be noted, that in case of such a proportionable satisfaction, by which the honour and equity of his law is vindicated, his justice, holiness, and hatred of sin demonstrated, the ends of government attained, he may relax and dispense with his threatnings as to the party offending, which is the case here, for by executing the threatning upon Christ, and receiving a valuable consideration and satisfaction from him, he hath given as eminent demonstration of his righteousness, purity, and hatred of sin, and as fully vindicated his law from contempt, as if the offenders themselves had suffered, and therefore by an admirable mixture of grace with his justice hath released us. I do not say, he hath released his law for I think, that is only *interpreted*; now interpretation doth not take off the *obligation of the law*, only *declares that in such a case it was*

Though I use these words instead of better, yet I would not be understood as if there were any *mutatio, abrogatio, dispensatio, aut relaxatio legis; nihil tale hic locum habere credo, tantum per additionem legis fidei ad legem operum divini juris & latæ legis, exhibetur interpretatio.*

not intended to oblige. Having now premiſed theſe things, I reaſſume the argument, namely, that the truth of God's threatning would not allow him to pardon ſin and ſave ſinners, but upon the conſideration of a ſatisfaction.

1. God having denounced death, and the curſe againſt ſin, *Gen. 2. 17. Deut. 27. 26.* The *veracity* and *faithfulneſs of his nature*, obliged him to ſee it inflicted. Never any intertained a notion of God, but they included in it that he *ſpake truth*; could ever any threatning of God be of awe upon the conſcience of a ſinner, ſhould the firſt and great threatning be made ſo eaſily void? ſhould it be granted, that notwithſtanding God's ſolemn denunciation of wrath in caſe of ſin, that yet he hath taken the offendor into favour, and pardoned the offence without any ſatisfaction or conſideration at all; what would

would creatures imagine? but that God either intended his threatnings for meer scarcrows, or that he were subject to mutability; which apprehensions being once recieved, what boldness would men assume in sin? believing that the comminations of the Gospel, would be no more executed than those of the law. *But let God be true, and every man a liar*, Rom. 3. 4.

2. To suppose that God hath abrogated his threatnings, is at once to overthrow the whole Scripture, for that expresly tells us, *That not one jot of the Law was to perish*, Mat. 5. 18. *That every disobedience received a just recompence of reward*, Heb. 2. 2. see *Heb.* 8. 28. *Heb.* 9. 22, 23. *That without blood there was to be no remission.*

3. If the threatning annexed to the law be released, it is either by virtue of the law it self, or by virtue of the Gospel. It is not by

virrue of the law, for that was wholly inexorable, requiring either perfect and constant obedience, or denouncing unmixed and unallay'd wrath, *Gal.* 3. 10. Nor is it released by the Gospel, this the Holy Ghost clearly informs us, *Rom.* 3. 31. *Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law.* Beza his Pataphrase here is very good, *Christi satisfactio quid aliud quam legis minas ostendit minimè irritas esse, quam illas luere Christum opportuerit? & Christi justitia quid aliud est quam legis præstatio?* See also *Mat.* 5. 17, 18. *Think not* (saith Christ) *that I come to destroy the Law or the Prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily, I say unto you; till heaven and earth pass away, one jot, or one title shall in no wise pass from the Law, till all be fulfilled.* As all the predictions of the Prophets were fulfilled by him, and in him

καταργέω significat inutilem, otiosum, inanem reddere. ἱστῶμεν, i. e. stare facimus, firmam efficacem reddimus bono cum ei suum defendimus. καταλύσαι, significat abolere, abrogare factis, vel dictis legem oppugnare. q. d. cælum terræ miscebitur potius, quam ut id fiat.

ſo was the whole law in his keeping the precepts of it, and teaching others to do the like, and in his bearing the penalty of it, and his fulfilling and anſwering the types of it. The Goſpel is ſo far from repealing the penalty of the law, that the very Goſpel is founded in Chriſt's undertaking to bear the penalty of it, *Heb.* 9. 15, 16. There could have been no Teſtament, but in and through the death of the Teſtator. There could have been no ſuch thing as a Goſpel, or tender of glad tydings and mercy to us, but through Chriſt's undertaking as our ſurety to bear the curſe of the law, *Gal.* 3. 13. And ſo much for the firſt argument from the truth of God's threatning.

2. It was not poſſible for God upon the Plea of meer mercy, without any conſideration or ſatisfaction, to forgive ſin and releaſe the ſinner, becauſe the juſtice,

ſtice, holineſs, and righteouſneſs of his nature would not allow it. The neceſſity of a ſatisfaction is not only founded in the wiſdome and ſoveraignty of God; God thought it convenient, and would have it ſo: but it is founded in the holineſs, juſtice, and righteouſneſs of God: His nature would not otherwiſe admit him to forgive ſin and ſave ſinners, *Heb.* 2. 10. It became God, this refers to God's nature, not his meer will. This will the better appear,

Mirum quantum peſtilentiſſimo ſocino gratificentur, qui aliter ſentiunt, Amyr. Theſ. Salm de neceſ. ſatisf. See this Text vindicated in the Appendix.

1. If we conſider the nature of ſin, which in it ſelf, abſtracting from any conſtitution of God about it, deſerves to be puniſhed. I do not ſpeak univerſally of all ſins, for there are ſome things indifferent, and become evil only by virtue of the Divine prohibition; but there are other things naturally evil without any enacting will of God about them, As to love, fear, and reverence God, are du-

ties

ties founded in our very natures, to which we had ſtood obliged though there had never been any poſitive precept of God enjoining them. So to deny or hate God are eſſentially evil, previouſly to any prohibition of God about them; otherwiſe they might have been duties ſuppoſing God had commanded them, which he might have done, if they were in themſelves things indifferent, and became evil only from his free prohibition; but that theſe could have been duties, I think no man dare ſay, that knows whereof he affirms. As there is an eternal comelineſs, that a reaſonable creature ſhould love and honour God; ſo there is an everlaſting indecency and horridneſs, that a rational ſoul ſhould hate or contemn him. That theſe things are good and evil, doth not depend ſo much on God's will, as his nature, and for God to will that the one ſhould

Dic ergo cur adulterium male fieri putes, an quia id facere, lex vetat? non ſane ideo malum eſt quia vetatur lege, ſed ideo vetatur lege, quia malum. Auguſt. li. 1. de libero Arbit.

be

be bad, and the other good, were for him to change his holy and unchangeable nature, which is impossible; he cannot do it, not through any defect, but through infiniteness of perfection, see 2 *Tim.* 2. 13. *Tit.* 1. 2. It being then obtained that there were somethings evil, antecedently to any determination of God's will about them, it naturally follows, that there belonged a dueness of punishment to those things, there being an indispensable connexion betwixt moral evil and physical. He that does ill, deserves to suffer ill: Neither divine wisdome nor righteousness can allow, that sin and impunity should for ever dwell together. It is the highest point of reason, that he who provokes God, should forfeit his favour, and feel his anger; and if so, then without a satisfaction it cannot be otherwise, for the justice of God requires that every thing should have its due

Si non reddit faciendo quod debet, reddet patiendo quod debet, Augustin. *Nemo malus felix,* Juven.

due, though it be under the Freedome of God's will, whether he will punish sin in the person of the sinner, or the surety; yet it is not under the freedom of his will, whether he will punish sin or not. Though the putting forth of justice in these or in other effects, be under the liberty of the Divine will, yet the punishing of sin in a way of vindictive justice is not; but it results necessarily from the nature of sin, to which punishment is indispensably due.

2. It further appears; if we consider the nature of God, and the account Scripture gives us of it, with reference to sin and sinners. He is every where represented as hating them, *Psal.* 5. 4, 6, 7. *Thou hast no pleasure in wickedness, thou hatest the workers of iniquity*, Jer. 44. 4. *Do not the abominable thing, which I hate.* Psal. 11. 5. *The wicked, and him that loveth violence his soul hateth.* See *Deut.*

12.

12. 31. *Mal.* 2. 16. *Zech.* 11. 8. *Levit.* 16. 30. *Levit.* 20. 23. &c. and why doth God abhorr and loath sin and sinners? is it only from the determination of his will he hath decreed and determined so? No, not only so, but from the purity and justice of his nature, because without ceasing to be a holy and righteous God, he cannot do otherwise. *Hab.* 1 13. *Thou art of purer eyes, than to behold iniquity, and canst not look on evil.* Josh. 24. 19. *Ye cannot serve the Lord, for he is an holy God, he is a jealous God, he will not forgive your transgressions nor your sins.* The principle in God, by virtue of which he punisheth sin, is not so much any free act of his will, as the justice and purity of his nature. See 2 *Thes.* 1. 6. *It is a righteous thing with God, to recompence tribulation to them that trouble you*, Rom. 2. 5. *Rev.* 16. 5, 7. *Rev.* 19. 11. Justice in

God

God is a property of his nature, as well as his mercy and goodness are; *Exod.* 34. 7. *Exod.* 20, 5. It is a contradiction to suppose a God, and not suppose him just; there is no possibility of framing a notion of God, without including justice in it. And if it were not thus, it is not imaginable, how the heathens should come to have an ingraft notion of God's punishing sin; for what depends meerly upon the will of God, is no other ways to be known but by revelation: but that the Gentiles without revelation are under a knowledge that God will punish sin, the Apostle informs us, *Rom.* 1. 32. *Knowing the judgments of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death.* It was from hence that their accusations of conscience arose, *Rom.* 2. 15. From hence also sprung their several endeavours and attempts to appease God by lustrations, hecatombs, sacri-

See Heb. 10. 30, 31. Nahum. 1. 3. Deut 4. 24. Num. 14. 18.

ſacrifices, &c. From all which clearly follows that vindictive juſtice is an eſſential property of God. If juſtice be to give every thing its due, we muſt needs aſcribe it to God, unleſs we will ſuppoſe him to act contrary to the principles and meaſures of all equity. If in man, it be a virtue and perfection becoming a rational nature, we muſt either give it to God, or ſuppoſe him to be an unreaſonable Being.

3. This may be further ſtrengthened, if we conſider God acting towards us as Supream Governor, Ruler, and Judge. God having created Man a rational creature, behoved to give him a law. It is a contradiction for a man to be a man, and not obliedged to love, fear, and obey God. Thoſe things man became obliedged to, without any other conſtitution of God's will about him, ſave only his making him a man, though God might

hav

ave chosen, whether he would ave made such a creature as man r not, yet on supposition that he akes such a creature; it necessarily results from his very nature, hat he should reverence, love, nd serve God. Now this being nce established, that man beoved to be under a law, it as necessarily follows, that God as the oly and just Governour of the orld, should make punishment ue to him, in case he broke that w. Duety being once constituted, though there had been no nalty annexed to the law, yet e dueness of punishment ariseth om the nature of sin. *Reatus lpæ, & reatus pœnæ*, howsoer they may be separable in some ses in humane laws, they are not in divine. In brief, if there ere not penalties annexed to ws, they would be contemptible ings, and Government would be t an empty notion. Now the

dueness of punishment bei
granted in case of sin: It follow
by a like necessity, that in case p
nishment become actually du
God as righteous Judge and G
vernour should execute it. G
18. 25. *Shall not the Judge of*
the earth do right. Execution is
needful a part of God's governi
his creatures, as Legislation; a
if this were wanting all laws w
ridiculous things: the forbear
to execute punishment, would
nothing less than to invite and
courage sin. To conclude, th
is no presumption *ingrafted* mo
into the hearts of men than this,

Injusti judicis est beneagentem non rem punerare, & negligentem non corripere, Senc.

——— *Prima est hæc ultio, quod s*
Judice, nemo nocens absolvitur.

And thus I have overthrown t
first plea of a guilty sinner; nam
ly, that of mercy for the sake
mercy; and shown that it is n
only a contradiction that
shou

should be justified upon that plea; but likewise that it was not possible, that upon that plea we should have been so much as pardoned.

Object. 1. *But it is objected, that there could be no need of a satisfaction, unless we will deny that to God, which we daily allow to men: we admit them to forgive injuries without any satisfaction, and shall we not allow God to do the like? we grant that men may remit of their right, and shall we say that God cannot remit of his?* To this I offer these several things by way of Answer. Obj. 1.

1. If by our remitting injuries be meant the retaining or receiving the offending party into our intimate favour and friendship, then it may be questioned, whether we be bound to forgive injuries otherwise than upon the terms recorded by *Luke* 17. 4. *If thy Brother trespass against thee, [illegible] return, saying, I repent, thou shalt* Answ. 1. *Vid. Grot. in Luc. 17. 4.*

forgive him. Though, as we have said before, confession of a fault, and deprecation of wrath be no satisfaction to the law, nor compensation for a crime; yet in cases of private injuries betwixt Brother and Brother it is a kind of a satisfaction, and as much benefit and honor may arise to the injured party from it, as he sustained dammage by the offence: But if by remitting injuries be meant only the not persuing revenge against the offendor, I grant that in some cases this both may and ought to be, notwithstanding he should prove obstinate in his offence: But now that which is intended by God's forgiving us, is not only his superceding to execute wrath upon us, but also the taking us into friendship and favour with himself again, and the wrong being done to the law, and God being in this whole affair to be considered as judge, there is no

arguing

arguing therefore from the one case to the other.

(2.) There are cases wherein not so much as in the last sense ought private persons to forgive injuries without a satisfaction. If one murther anothers Son, it is not in the Father's power to remit it, but he is bound to prosecute the revenge of it upon the offendor: Though a private person may remit in cases which refer only to his own utility and profit, yet he ought not to do the like in cases where honesty, and the maintaining of good manners is concern'd. Answ. 2.

(3.) Whatever may be allowed to a private person in reference to an injury done to himself, yet a publick person or Magistrate ought not to forgive an injury done to the law, though a Judge may remit a pecuniary debt due to himself, yet he cannot remit a criminal offence committed a- Answ. 3.

gainst the State. Supposing that the Papists should be convicted of having burnt *London*, though the Judges in that case might forgive the crime so far as their own houses were concern'd (which I also question) yet they are bound to punish it, as it is a wrong to mankind, to all communities, the whole Nation, and the Protestant Religion: Now God in this Transaction is not to be considered as an absolute Lord, or as a meer Creditor, but as Supream Rector and Governour. It is true, he that is Rector, is both absolute Lord and also Creditor, yet we are in this affair to consider him only as Rector; and therefore, though it were possible for him to pardon sin as he is, *Pars læsa*, *The party wronged* (though to pardon or to punish, appertain to none under that relation) yet he is obliged to punish it, as he is the holy and righteous ruler of mankind, other-

wise

wise he ſhould be unjuſt in his rectorſhip. The end of the law would be ſubverted; and he ſhould not act as becomes a juſt Governour: for *delicta puniri publicè intereſt.* And as *Lactantius* ſays very well, *Non eſt enim fas, cum, cum talia fieri videat, non moveri, & inſurgere ad ultionem ſceleratorum, & peſtiferos, nocentesque delere, ut bonis omnibus conſulat.* Now that God in this tranſaction is to be conſidered only as Rector, appears,

(1.) Becauſe, to abſolve and condemn are acts no wiſe peculiar to any but a Governour: None may adminiſter theſe acts, under the relation of being either an abſolute Lord, or an offended and provoked party, but only under the relation of being veſted with Government. *Surgimus ad vindictam, non quia læſi ſumus, ſed ut diſciplina ſervetur, mores corrigantur, licentia comprimatur; hæc*

est ira justa, quæ fieri in homine necessaria est, sic etiam deo, à quo ad hominem pervenit exemplum. Lact.

(2.) Because for one to exact his debt or to remit it, to use his right or release it, are no wise acts of justice: We do not call it justice, for a man to claim or remit that which is owing to him; or for a person to pursue or release his right, where he hath an absolute power: But now the Scripture stiles it an act of justice in God, both to inflict punishment upon sinners, and also to justifie believers: for the first see 2 *Thes.* 1. 6. *Heb.* 2. 2. *Rev.* 16. 5, 6, 7. and 19. 2. The inflicting punishment upon sinners, is that which the justice of God requireth, hence called δικαιοκρισία τ̃ θεοῦ, *The judgement of God*, Rom. 1. 32. and therefore not only the punishment inflicted is called *Iustus Vengeance*, Jude 7. but the principle and pro-

perty

perty in God, that constitutes and
nflicts it, is also so stiled, Act.
28. 4. For the last see, Rom. 3.
25, 26.

(3.) Because, for a person to re-
mit his right where he hath abso-
ute power, or to forgive a debt
where he is sole creditor, are in no
ases, contrary to the lines of ju-
ice, and no person becomes un-
ust for doing so; but in some
ases to remit sin, for example,
here it is not so much as repent-
d of, according to our very ad-
ersaries, is inconsistent with ju-
ice, and by consequence God
the punishing or pardoning of
n, doth not act as Creditor or
ord, but as Judge and Gover-
our.

(4.) Because the end of a Lord
s pursuing his right, and a Cre-
tor his exacting of his debt, is
eir own benefit, and interest;
t the end of inflicting punish-
ent, is the interest of government,

and

and the benefit of the world ; that these two differing in the ends, and the ground of God's inflicting punishment being last, it necessarily follows, that is to be look't upon in this who transaction, as a Governour, as a meer Creditor, or as an absolute Lord.

Answ. 4. (4.) It is a strange kind of Arguing, that because one man may remit an offence committed against him, (may be by his equal, at least by his fellow creature) that therefore God ought to do the like by us, who being the work-manship of his own hands, have yet rebelled against him. What kind of reasoning would it be? that because we are not upon every injury to pursue the ruin of one another, that therefore God without the impeachment of his mercy and goodness may not inflict vengeance upon sinners: or because we may be bound in case a man has wrong

onged us, and doth not ſo
ch as repent of it, but perſe-
re in it; yet nevertheleſs to for-
e him; ſhall we therefore in-
that God ſhould forgive a man
s ſins, as well in caſe he perſevere
them and repent not, as in caſe
reform and repent?

(5.) Is there no difference be- Anſw. 5.
ixt God his abating in his
ght, and his total parting with
? is it not ſomething that he
ill allow a ſurety, but that he
uſt altogether releaſe the debt?
nnot God be gracious without
aſing to be juſt? God might
ve moſt juſtly damned us, he
as under no neceſſity of extend-
g mercy to us, any more than
fallen Angels; and he hath re-
itted of the rigour of his ju-
ce in that he hath contrived
nd allowed the intervention of
Mediator.

(6.) This Objection con- Anſw 6.
unds God's power, with his ju-
ſtice;

stice; whereas the question
not what God in way of unli
ted power can do, but what
agreeableness to the righteo
ness of his nature is fit for him
do. It is not through want of po
er, that he cannot pardon
without a satisfaction, but b
cause he is infinitely holy a
just as well as powerful, and
thereby obliged to do nothi
unbeseeming the purity a
righteousness of his nature.

Answ. 7. (7) We are not only to co
fid r what God might have do
without the impeachment of h
justice, but also that we ascri
nothing to him mis-becoming h
wisdom. That God should e
& a law, and in the most solem
way annex punishment to the v
olation of it, and yet being brok
en, should without any more ad
forgive the offendor, seems
p ain imprudence in Governmen
and altogether unworthy the wi
dom of God.

Bu

2. *But it is again Objected, that sin* Object.
every where said to be forgiven,
doned, remitted; and the for-
veness of it attributed to mercy
d grace, and consequently that
re can be no satisfaction made
it, there being nothing more
ntrary to forgiveness, than com-
nsation, nor more opposite to grace
an what is paid for. Thus the
mphletter, p. 6, 7, 8, 9. out of his
sters, Socinus, Crellius, &c.
o which I offer these things by
y of return.

(1.) It is a most ignorant mis- Answ 1.
ke, that satisfaction made by
hrist, and forgiveness made to
, are opposite and inconsistent;
herens Scripture every where
lds forth the agreement be-
ixt these two, *Rom.* 3. 24, 25.
ng justified freely by his grace,
ough the redemption that is in
sus Christ, &c. Where though
rgiveness be held forth as free
d of grace, yet it is also decla-

red

red to be through Christ, as a pr
pitiation, and by virtue of
redemption, which by his blo
he had purchased and wrough
See also *Eph.* 1. 7. *Col.* 1. 14.
is said to be free and of grace
reference to us, to exclude the
rit of our works, not in respect
Christ, to exclude his satisfac
on. Herein God hath display
the depths of his wisdome,
pardon is both of grace and
merit, that it is at once an act
mercy, and an act of righteo
ness.

Answ. 2. (2.) It hath been already sho
wherein the grace and freenes
remission consists, and that it
wise stands, either in the want
a satisfaction or in any deficie
in the satisfaction that was ma
Let the adversary, if he ple
attempt to overthrow what
been spoken to that purpose,
shall find us ready upon all oc
to vindicate it.

(3.)

(3.) The clearing of this shall be further essayed in the Appendix. Answ. 3.

2. The second and only plea then of a charged sinner is to plead for justification, upon the accounts of a satisfaction made to the party offended for the offence, and this satisfaction must be pleaded, either as made by our selves, or made by another in our stead.

1. It cannot be pleaded, that we have made any satisfaction our selves: There are but three ways can with any seemingness be insisted on to this purpose, and it is altogether impossible it should be made any of these ways.

1. Some may be ready to imagine, that satisfaction might be made by sacrifices and costly offerings, and that by them God's wrath might be appeased, and the guilt of sin expiated. Sacrifices were

were of God's own appointment
and after the fall the first piece of
instituted worship, *Gen.* 4. 3.
Rom. 14. 23. *Heb.* 11. 4. By faith
Abel *offered*; which implies the
warrant of a command: and if
this were not necessary, there
would be no such thing as will-
worship in the world, and faith
would differ nothing from a blind
venturous boldness. Now sa-
crifices may be considered two
ways.

First, As an Appendix of the
Covenant of works, and as they
were intended to testifie guilt;
and in that sense the Apostle is to
be understood, *Col.* 2. 14. *The*
hand writing of Ordinances that
was against us, which was contrary
to us. Ephes. 2. 15. *Having abo-*
lished in his flesh the enmity, even
the law of commandments contain-
ed in Ordinances.

Secondly, They are conside-
rable as subservient to the Cove-

nant of grace. As they were our School-master to lead to Christ, *Gal.* 3. 24. As they were shadows and he the body, *Col.* 2. 17. And as they were types of the great sacrifice which he was to offer, *Heb.* 9. 9. God having made man a promise of recovery and redemption, through the seed of the woman, *Gen.* 3. 15. and it being necessary that this should be accomplished in the way of death and blood, *Heb.* 9. 15, 22. God therefore appointed sacrifices, to typifie and prefigure the great sacrifice of the Messiah; and in this sense among others may *Rev.* 13. 8. be understood, (if that be the right reading of the place) *The Lamb slain from the foundation of the world*; not only in the virtue and the efficacy of his death, but also with respect to the sacrifices, which prefigured his death. Now the generality of mankind soon sunk

into an ignorance of the right end of ſacrifices, and inſtead of conſidering them as Divine appointments, to repreſent the ſacrifice of the Son of God, and to ſtrengthen their faith in that: they begin to rely upon them alone, for expiation of guilt and right to life. But that no ſatisfaction can be made by ſacrifices, appears.

Sacrificia conſiderantur, vel quatenus typi erant futuræ ſatisfactionis Meſſiæ, vel quatenus illis vis expiandi per ſe adſcribebatur; priori modo Deus illa voluit, poſteriori ea rejecit, Wilth.

(1.) In that Scripture expreſſ rejects all ſacrifices, when truſte to for that end and purpoſe, *Pſa* 40. 6. *Sacrifice and offering tho didſt not deſire, mine ears haſt tho opened; burnt-offering and ſin-o fering haſt thou not required*, i. e. did not deſire them as means b which ſin could be expiated. S *Pſal.* 50. 8. to 12. *Micah* 6. 6, *Heb.* 9. 9. and 10. 1, 2, 3, 4. G in Scripture expreſſeth his diſli of ſacrifices upon three occaſion (1.) Becauſe of the prophaneſs the Offerers, *Iſa.* 1. 11, 12. &c. 18. *Iſa.* 66. 5. *Jer.* 6. 20. (2

Wh

When they were preferred to moral obedience, 1 *Sam.* 15. 22. *Hoſ.* 6. 6. *Jer.* 7. 21, 22. (3.) When truſted to for juſtification and life, as we have juſt before expreſſed.

(2.) There is no worth in the blood of a Bull or Goat, to make reparation for the diſhonour done by ſin to God; he muſt have very mean thoughts both of ſin and God, that thinks his juſtice can be ſatisfied, or the guilt of ſin expiated by the bloud of a Calf or Lamb. The wrong done by ſin being infinite, juſtice requireth that the ſatisfaction ſhould be proportionable.

(3.) Nor was there any proportion nor *relation* either, betwixt the ſinner and the ſacrificed beaſt, that the blood and death of the one, ſhould paſs for a ſatisfaction for the ſin and offenſe of the other. There ſhould be a conjunction in *Nature*, betwixt him that commits the offence, and him that makes

the ſatisfaction; in what nature the ſin is committed, in that nature the reparation ſhould be made; there being therefore no *communion in nature* betwixt a beaſt and a man, the blood of the one cannot paſs for a ſatisfaction for the crime of the other.

(4.) Becauſe it is neceſſary that whoever makes ſatisfaction for another, ſhould conſent and willingly ſubmit to ſuch an undertaking; now a beaſt is altogether uncapable of ſtipulation or agreeing to ſuch an exchange, *Pſal.* 118. 27. and therefore can no wiſe make ſatisfaction. The Heathen could ſay,

Quum ſis ipſe nocens moritur cu
victima prote,
Stultitia eſt morte alterius ſperar
ſalutem.

So that upon the whole it is clear we cannot plead a ſatisfaction by ſacrifice. (2.) O

2. Others poſſibly may be ready to inſiſt on moral obedience as if by that we could make God a valuable compenſation for the wrong we have done him. This was the the great refuge of the Jews of old, *Rom.* 2. 17. *They reſted in the law.* Rom. 9. 31. *They followed after the law*, i. e. they expected life and righteouſneſs, in and through the obſervance of the law; not that they thought themſelves able ſo univerſally to keep it, as not at all to ſin, but they apprehended that they ſufficiently kept the law to juſtification, if they performed the outward acts of duety, and forbore the outward acts of ſin, or if their good works were more than their evil, *Mat.* 19. 18, 19, 20. *Phil.* 3. 6. but that there is no coming off on this Plea, II.

(1.) The Scripture every where informs us, in its diſclaiming all poſſibility of being juſtified by

works, *Rom.* 3. 20. *By the deeds of the law, there ſhall no fleſh be juſtified in his ſight.* Gal. 3. 21, 22. *If there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteouſneſs ſhould have been by the law, but the Scripture hath concluded all under ſin,* &c. *Rom.* 8 3. *what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the fleſh,* &c. The law, had we kept it, by continuing in the ſtate wherein we were created, was both appointed and able to have given life, but man by ſin becoming fleſh, the law ſtood by, as altogether inſufficient to help ſuch an one; and is therefore called the miniſtration of death, 2 *Cor.* 3. 7. and of condemnation, 2 *Cor.* 3. 9. and though it was afterward continued for other ends, yet it was never intended that they ſhould have life and righteouſneſs by it.

(2.) The obedience of the law is ſuch as never any ſinner did or can

can perform, *Pſal.* 143. 2. *In thy ſight ſhall no man living be juſtified*, i.e. upon a perſonal righteouſneſs of his own. *Pſal.* 130. 3. *If thou, Lord, ſhouldſt mark iniquities, O Lord, who ſhall ſtand.* The law required not only a perſonal, but an univerſal, perfect, and perpetual obedience, and as to all the laſt three we are ſadly defective, and accordingly thoſe Saints, who had as much to plead this way as any, yet conſtantly diſclaim'd being juſtified on this ſcore, *Pſal.* 19. 12. *Pſal.* 40. 12. *My ſins are more than the hairs of my head.* As if he had ſaid, I may ſooner tell my hairs than reckon my ſins, *Job* 9. 2, 3, 15, 20, 21, 30. read it at leiſure. See alſo 2 *Cor.* 4. 4. *Though I know nothing by my ſelf, yet am I not hereby juſtified*, Phil. 3 8, 9.

(3.) Were it poſſible that we could give God a perfect and univerſal obedience (which we never can) yet it were no more than a

debt which we owe him, as we are his *Creatures*, and therefore could be no satisfaction from us, as we are his *delinquents*. Whatever we are or have, it being from God, we owe him the farthest improvement of all, without rendring him beholding; yea, in the state wherein he created us, he might have obliged us to the utmost obedience, and after all that, instead of any reward, have reduced us into the state of nothing, out of which he raised us; being fallen, more than we can yield, is a debt we owe him as our Maker, and therefore can be no satisfaction to him as an offended Judge. *One debt* useth not to go in *payment* for *another*, if a man commit one treasonable act, and for a time make an escape, but be afterwards apprehended, it will be no Plea in Law, to say he is Loyal now, because he was bound to have been so before, and therefore must satisfie

sfie for his former disloyalty.

(4.) All the obedience we are ver able to yield to God, it is rough the alone strength and in-uence of his grace, *Joh.* 15. 5. *Cor.* 3. 5. And therefore instead being a satisfaction to his ju-ice, we are made fresh debtors to s mercy.

(5.) One sin dishonours God ore than an eternity of obedience n recompence; all our service ings no accession to God to me-any thing at his hand. *Job* 22. 3. *Can a man be profitable to d? is it pleasure to the Almighty t thou art righteous? or is it in to him, that thou makest thy ys perfect?* Job 35. 7. *If thou righteous what giveſt thou unto m? or what receiveth he at thine nd?* see also *Psal.* 16. 2, 3. *Luc.* . 10. *Rom.* 11. 35. *Acts* 17. 25. t the least sin is a derogation m his honour, and lays us under obnoxiousness to eternal wrath.

(6.) Justi-

(6.) Juſtification upon the ple
of obedience is that which the A
poſtle through the Epiſtles to th
Romans and *Galatians* ſo large
diſputes againſt, and therefore w
muſt either make nonſenſe of a
his arguments, or we muſt el
confeſs that there is no being juſti
fied upon this plea.

III. 3. It remains, that if we mak
ſatisfaction by our ſelves, it mu
be alone done by ſufferings. Th
Papiſts, though they agree with u
about the truth of Chriſts ſatisfa
ction, yet they greatly deroga
from it in the eſtabliſhing the n
ceſſity of humane ſatisfaction
It is true, their doctrine is a litt
intricate in this affair, they are n
accorded among themſelves, eith
as to the extent or the condignit
of ſuch ſatisfactions, yet they a
meet in this, that Chriſt hath n
ſo ſatisfied as to remove the who
puniſhment, but that there is ſom
of the legal penalty ſtill to be u

dergo

rgone by our ſelves, which is
artly born in puniſhments in this
fe, and partly in purgatory tor-
ents in the future. This they
lliate by diſtinguiſhing betwixt
moving of the fault, and re-
oving of the puniſhment: The
ult is the offence committed
ainſt God, which is done away
remiſſion; the puniſhment is
e penalty, which after the fault
removed, remains, *ſay they*,
ll to be ſuffered; and by the
aring of which, either in our own
rſons, or one for another, we
ake God formal ſatisfaction.

But (1.) we have already prov-
, that the bearing of the penal-
, doth conſtitute no man who is
ce unjuſt, juſt again. The firſt
tention of the law is obedience,
d nothing doth ſatisfie the pri-
ary deſign of the law but that.
grant that in humane laws in
me caſes it may be otherwiſe,
mely where the law is purely
penal,

penal, the intention of the la
giver being neither preciſely
command not forbid any thin
but on a penalty to allow th
which otherwiſe he prohibite
As for example, that if a perſ
be choſen Sheriff of *London*,
ſhall either hold, or pay ſuch
fine: The paying the fine do
here ſatisfie the law, foraſmuch
the law did not preciſely enjoy
the party to hold, but only boun
him to the payment of ſuch
ſumm in caſe he would not. B
in Divine Laws the caſe is diffe
rent, the end of all God's Law
being obedience, and the penalt
being annexed only for other ends

(2.) The diſtinction upon whic
the Papiſts here proceed, implie
one of the abſurdeſt things ima
ginable; namely, that the faul
ſhould be remitted, and not the
puniſhment; that the debt ſhould
be forgiven, and yet payment ex
acted; ſeeing the forgiving the
debt,

debt, is nothing else but the dis-
olving the offenders obligation to
punishment. See *Mat.* 18. 17.

(3.) Sin being of an infinite de-
merit, requires an infinite penalty,
now a penalty can be infinite only
one of three ways.

(1.) Through the infinite worth
of the person sustaining the pu-
nishment, and in this sense I sup-
pose none will say that man is of
such value and dignity, as that any
suffering he undergoes should be
accounted infinite.

(2.) A penalty may be infinite
from the infinite weight of what is
inflicted and sustained, and in this
sense no man can undergo an infi-
nite punishment; forasmuch as no
finite creature can bear any weight
but what is finite.

(3.) A punishment may be in-
finite as to length and duration, but
for to think that a person can sa-
tisfie by bearing a punishment
which is infinite as to continuance,
involves,

(1.) A

(1.) A plain contradiction, being for ever to ſuffer, and nev to ſatisfie; for ever to be damne and never acquitted.

(2.) Such kind of ſuffering do not ſatisfie the primary intentio of the law, ſeeing law and juſti in their firſt intention, require th the puniſhment be commenſura to the crime in the weight of i rather than in the length. S that upon the whole we cannot b juſtified upon the plea of havin made a ſatisfaction our ſelves.

If we plead juſtification then upon the account of a ſatisfaction it muſt be alone, becauſe of a ſa tisfaction made by another: an this leads me to the next point, th ground and matter of our juſtifi cation, *viz.* the ſatisfaction o Chriſt.

CHAP

CHAP. IV.

Other ſupream ends of the death of Chriſt diſclaimed. That he did not dye primarily to ſeal and confirm the covenant, nor to give us an example of ſuffering with patience.

2. THE ſecond and only Plea of a guilty ſinner is, that Chriſt hath made ſatisfaction. To this end he was incarnate, and for this end he died. That there were other ſubordinate ends of his Incarnation, Obedience, and Paſſion is not denied; but that any thing elſe was either the ſupream, or the only end, muſt not be granted. *That which is firſt pleaded by the Socinians, is that all which Chriſt underwent was to ratifie and confirm his Doctrine, having preached the freeneſs of remiſſion to ſuch as ſhould repent. And men finding a witneſs in themſelves of their liableneſs to wrath and death, being*

ready

ready to ſuſpect every propoſal [illegible] *grace and favour; therefore Chriſt by his death (ſay they) made faith of, and gave aſſurance of what he had taught.* Now that what we have to offer in oppoſition to this may be the better ſecured againſt all exceptions, we premiſe three things to be firſt taken notice of.

1. That Chriſt anſwerable to the threefold neceſſity that we were in, ſtood in a threefold office. As we were ignorant of God, he was our Prophet, *Joh.* 6. 14. *Act.* 3. 22, 23. As we were under the guilt of ſin, he was our Prieſt, *Heb.* 2. 17. *Heb.* 7. 26, 27. As we were in bondage to ſin and Satan, he was conſtituted our Captain and King, *Iſa.* 55. 4. *Heb.* 2. 10. *Dan.* 9. 25. Now as he is our Prophet, he not only reveals and makes known the Father to us, *Joh.* 1. 18. but hath alſo by his death ſealed and confirmed his doc-

ctrin

trine, *Joh.* 18: 37. As he is our Priest he hath by his death expiated sin, *Heb.* 9. 15. 1 *Joh.* 2. purchased remission to us, *Mat.* 26. 28. *Eph.* 1. 7. and ought grace for us, *Phil.* 1. 29. *Pet.* 2. 3. And as he is our King, he hath by his death conquered our enemies, *Col.* 2. 15. *Heb.* 14. and left us an example of suffering and patience. 1 *Pet.* 2. 21. Now one or more of these ends are not exclusive of the other, because some of these were the ends his death, we must not say that hers are not. But the Socinians they confound the Priesthood of hrist, either with his Kingship with his Prophetical Office; so ey confine the ends of his death, what meerly was done as he od in these relations: but as shall (God willing) hereafter monstrate him to be properly Priest, as well as a King, or pher: So for the present we

 distin-

distinguish what were the ends of his death as Priest, from those which were the ends of it, as he was King and Prophet.

2. We would have it observed, *that there were some more primary and principal ends of Christ's death, and others that were less principal and only secondary.* The more primary and principal end of his death, was that he might give himself a ransome for sinners, 1 *Tim.* 2. 6. be a propitiation for our offences, 1 *Joh.* 2. 2. and become a sacrifice for sin, *Heb.* 9. 26. and 10. 12. The secondary and less principal were, that he might ratifie the truth of his doctrine, and leave us an example of patience in suffering: Now the adversaries insist only upon the subordinate and secondary ends of his death, and altogether shut out the more principal and chief.

3. We would distinguish betwixt the *proper end of his death* and

and those things which are *the fruits and consequences* of it, through his having obtained that end. The *proper end* of the death of Christ, was the satisfying of God's justice, and the vindicating his Law and Government, *Rom.* 3. 25. and 4. 25. but the fruits and consequences of it through his having compassed that end, are our deliverance from the curse and condemnation of the law, *Gal.* 3. 13. *Rom.* 8. 34. The remission of our sins, *Col.* 1. 14. justification at the Bar of God, *Rom.* 5. 9. and a right and title to life, 1 *Pet.* 3. 18. *Rom.* 5. 18. Having now premised these things, we come to prove that the confirmation of the doctrine of the Gospel, could not be the only nor yet the principal end of the death of Christ.

1. Because the truth of his doctrine was otherwise sufficiently established; for being demon-

ſtrated to be from God, there needed no further evidence of the truth of it; and that it was from God was abundantly proved,

(1.) By thoſe motives of credibility, and inbred evidence which it carried in it; if we conſider the Purity, Majeſty, Plainneſs, Fullneſs, Method and Manner in which delivered, it is not poſſible, but that without further means of conviction, we may be aſcertained that God is the Author of it.

(2.) God himſelf by the Teſtimony and Atteſtation of Miracles gave irrefragable evidence that it was true, and from himſelf, *Heb.* 2. 4. ——— *God bearing witneſs, with ſigns, and wonders, and divers miracles*, &c. *Act.* 2. 22. *Jeſus a man approved of God amongſt you, by miracles, wonders, and ſigns, which God did by him in the midſt of you*, &c. and it was to theſe that Chriſt ſo often appealed for the truth of his doctrine, *Joh.* 5. 36. *I have*

I have a greater witneſs than that of John; *for the works which the Father hath given me to finiſh, the ſame works that I do, bear witneſs of me, that the Father hath ſent me;* Joh. 10. 25. *The works that I do in my Fathers Name, they bear witneſs of me.* So *Joh* 15. 24. and *alibi.* And it was upon the conviction and evidence of theſe, that the world received his doctrine, *Joh.* 2. 23. *Many believed in his Name, when they ſaw the miracles which he did.* Joh. 3. 2. *We know that thou art a Teacher come from God: for no man can do theſe miracles that thou doſt, except God be with him,* Joh. 7. 31. *And many of the people believed on him, and ſaid, when Chriſt cometh, will he do more miracles, than theſe which this man hath done.* So that there was no neceſſity for Chriſt to have dyed in reference to this end, his doctrine being by other mediums ſufficiently confirmed, had there never

been any such thing as the death of Christ, yet there wanted not sufficient grounds by which a Divine Revelation might be known. Those that lived before the incarnation of Christ, were not without sufficient evidence of the truth and divinity of the doctrine of *Moses* and the Prophets, yet they had not this argument to establish and confirm them in the belief of it.

(5.) The needlessenes of Christs dying in relation to the ascertaining the truth of his doctrine appears hence, in that the highest argument and motive the Holy Ghost insinuateth in, in reference to the confirming any declaration of God is God's Oath, *Heb.* 6. 17, 18. So that if this had been the supream end of the death of Christ, I do not see how it was any wise necessary that Christ should have dyed, there having been other ways and means every way sufficient for the attaining of that end; yea,

can

annot understand how it is consistent with the wisdome, goodness, and righteousnes of God, to have put an innocent person, and one so dear to him as his own Son to death, when he might have spared him, and yet arrived at all he propounded by his sufferings.

2. If the confirming the truth of the Scripture, had been the supream end of all the sufferings of Christ, and if it be upon that account that he is so often said to have dyed for us; this is no more than what men are capable of doing, yea, than what the Martyrs have actually done, for they by sufferings, blood, and death have sealed and confirmed the truth of the Gospel, and yet they are never said to have dyed for us, or to have reconciled us to God by their blood; yea instead of this it is expresly denied, that they ever did, or could dye for us in that

ſenſe, and to that purpoſe the Chriſt did, 1 Cor. 1. 13. Act. 12. and by conſequence there behoved to be other and greater cauſes of the death and ſuffering of Chriſt, then the ſealing or confirming the truth of his doctrine.

3. It may from hence be further demonſtrated, that it was not the ſupreame end of Chriſt's dying, only to encourage us to believe the certainty of God's promiſe, in reference to the free remiſſion of ſin, becauſe the Scripture every where aſſigns other ends, namely, that he *might bear our ſins*, Rom. 4. 25. *deſtroy the enmity betwixt God and us*, Eph. 2. 16. *ſave us from periſhing, and give us a right to life*, Joh. 3. 16. So that the firſt Plea of the Sociniars remains confuted and overthrown.

2. *The ſecond end inſtanced in, and pleaded for as the impulſive cauſe*

cauſe of the ſufferings and death of Chriſt is, that he might give us an example of ſuffering with patience. It is not denied, but that the death of Chriſt is of ſingular import to theſe purpoſes, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. and 4. 1. *Heb.* 12. 2, 3. but yet theſe were not the principal ends of his ſufferings and death, neither were they indiſpenſably needful upon that ſcore.

(1.) Becauſe the Old Teſtament Saints were patiently carried through ſuffering, who (though they lived in the faith of the death of Chriſt) yet had not the lively example of the quality of his ſufferings, nor of his patience under them.

(2.) Becauſe upon theſe terms Chriſt ſhould not be properly our Saviour, but the act of ſaving us ſhould be our own: Chriſt ſhould only chalk us the way to ſalvation, whereas we ſhould go in it, and conſequently the act of

ſaving

saving us should be altogether ours.

(3.) Because God by the strength and influence of his grace could have carried us through suffering with patience, without setting us the pattern and example of his Son; and this he actually doth in that which is every way as difficult; for example, the mortifying of indwelling corruption; wherein the adversary dare not say, that Christ was capable of being our pattern. These being disclaimed then from being the supream ends of Christ his suffering, it follows that we demonstrate the true and principal end of his dying to have been that he might make satisfaction to God for us.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

The satisfaction of Christ established from Christ's bearing our sins. No impeachment of God's justice, that though innocent, he should suffer the punishment of the nocent. That he hath undergone what we should have undergone.

WE being in debt to God, Christ undertook to be our Surety, *Heb.* 7. 22. I do not deny but that he is also God's Surety to us, for the making good of all the promises, which are therefore said to be in him, yea and Amen, 2 *Cor.* 1. 20 and he is in reference to this called God's Witness, *Isa.* 55. 3, 4. But withall he is our Surety to God for the discharging of our debt: And that that is the intendment of the Apostle in the forequoted place appears from the context, in that he is there treating of the Priesthood of Christ; and particularly

ἐγγυος *Sponsor propriè est qui pro alio spondet, vel ut debitum solvat,* Prov. 22. 26. *vel ut* panam *luat,* Gen. 44 32, 33. Turret.

ly treating of it in reference t
those things which were to b
done with God for men. It i
true there were two parts of th
Priests office; one was to declar
God's statutes and ordinances t
the people, and to oversee hi
worship, according to his ow
institution and appointment: an
in this sense Christ is called, *Th*
High Priest of our profession, an
said to be faithful in God's house
Heb. 3. 1, 2. which is also the im
port of *Zech.* 6. 13. *He shall build*
the Temple of the Lord, and he
shall bear the glory, and shall sit and
rule upon his Throne, and he shall be
a Priest upon his Throne. The
other part was to offer sacrifice
for men to God, and to reconcile
God to the people, and this was
the principal part of the Priest's
office, *Heb.* 5. 1. the other being
only secondary, and consequent
to this. And in this sense the
Apostle in the foregoing place un-

derstands

erſtands Chriſt's Prieſthood, nd in reference to this notion of , ſtiles him ſurety, foraſmuch as e had our debt charged upon im, and ſuffered the penalty hich we ſhould have born. Ere e attempt the proof of this, we eſire firſt to eſtabliſh theſe two ings.

1. *It is not againſt juſtice for God to caſt pains upon an innocent perſon.* This the adverſary dare ot deny, foraſmuch as it was one in reference to Chriſt. I do ot now diſpute, whether thoſe ains were ſatisfactory; all at reſent I intend is, that God ithout injuſtice may inflict pains pon an innocent, as it is manifeſt he did upon Chriſt. Though mongſt men it be againſt all rinciples of juſtice, to take away he life of a guiltleſs perſon, ſeeing we have no natural and abſolute dominion over one another, either is there any ſuch power allowed

allowed us by the supream Sov
raign; yet God having an abs
lute dominion over the lives, b
dies, and fortunes of men, he ha
a right to act, what none el
without the grossest injustice
ver. *It is not in every case inj
for one to be made undergo the
nishment of anothers sin.* The
fants of *Sodome*, were involv
in the punishment of those crim
of which themselves were n
guilty, *Gen.* 19. *Cham* comm
ted the sin, and the slavery w
entailed upon *Canaan*, Gen. 9.
25. The Lye was singly *Gehez*
but yet the Leprosie clave not
him alone, but also to his posti
rity, 2 *Kings* 5. 27. Scriptu
furnisheth us with an infini
number of instances, where G
makes use of the Sons misery,
punish the Fathers offence.
2 *Sam* 21. 8, 14. and 24. 15,
Josh. 7. 24. 1 *Kings* 14. 10.
22. 30. *God threatens to visit*

iniqui

iquity of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation, *Exod.* 20. 5. Neither is this any more, then what in one instance or other hath been, and is still practiced among men in all Nations. If a person be convicted of Treason, his inheritance escheats to the Crown, and all right of claim ceaseth from his posterity. In pecuniary matters it cannot be denied, but that punishment may redound to the Surety: And in criminal cases, cautionaries have been often punished for others whom they have represented.

Now to render such a transaction just, that one be made to suffer for anothers fault, there are but these things necessary.

1. That the innocent person have a dominion over that which he parts with; hence a person having a dominion over his estate may alienate it to pay anothers debt;

debt, and had we as absolute powe
over our lives as over our mone
we might likewise dispose
them for the preservation of th
lives of others. And among th
Heathens, who apprehended th
they had the same right over th
one as over the other, there wa
not instances of that nature; ne
ther were those commutations
mong them ever blamed of inju
stice. The example of *Dam*
and *Pithias* is obvious. That which
alone renders such transactions un
just is, that we have not a domini
on over our lives, and so cannot
alienate and part with them: Bu
now Christ had a plenary domin
on over his own life, and so coul
freely dispose of it for the lives
others, *John* 10. 18. *I lay down my*
life of my self, I have power to la
it down.

2. That there be a willingnes
in the parties concerned, in the
Judg and Ruler, to allow and ac
cep

cept such a commutation in the *Obsest and Surety* to condescend to, nd engage in such an undertakng: There is no wrong done, nen all parties are willing. Now oth parties are here agreed; the ather in calling and inviting hrist to it, *John* 10. 18. — *I lay own my life* —— *this commandeent have I received of my Father*; he Son in readily, submitting to nd engaging in the work, *Heb.* 10. , 6, 7, 8, 9. —— *lo I am me*, &c.

3. That the party *stipulating* be ble to overcome all he exposeth imself to, and that those in hose stead he doth it, do thereby escape what they themselves ood omnoxious to. If either e be sure to perish in the engagement, or they for whom he undertakes be likely to receive no advantage by it, then the whole undertaking is altogether inconsistent ith wisdome, whatever it be

with righteousness. But now Je-
sus Christ know himself able t
discharge all he became boun
for, *Joh.* 10.18. *I lay down my life
and I take it up again.* And certai
deliverance was to attend those i
whose room he became substitute
Gal. 3. 13. *Christ hath redeemed u
from the curse of the law, being
made a curse for us.*

4. That there be some near con-
junction in him that suffers, with
those that should have suffered.
Justice doth not allow that a per-
son altogether inconcerned in the
offence, should be subjected to the
punishments due to those with
whom he hath no relation. But
now there is the nearest union be-
twixt Christ and those in whose
behalf he became engaged.

(1.) *There is an union of nature,*
the satisfaction is made in the same
nature in which the offence was
committed, *Heb.* 2. 14, 16. There
could have been no possibility of

saving

aving ſinners, without a ſatisfa-
tion in the nature that ſinned;
nd there was no need at all of
Chriſt's having aſſumed our na-
ure, but only in order that he
ight ſuffer and dye in it: And
he Apoſtle in forecited place,
aketh his aſſuming our nature,
he very foundation of his fitneſs
o undertake in our behalf, and the
round why the benefits of his ſuf-
ering do in juſtice redound to us.

(2.) Being one with us in na-
nre, *he became alſo one with us in*
aw: Though Phyſically the Sure-
y and Debter be two different
men, yet Juridically and *in conſpe-*
tu fori, in the account of the
aw, they are one and the ſame
perſon. Thus Chriſt being our
urety, was one with us legally,
nd in a law ſenſe became charge-
ble with, and puniſhable for all
our ſins, *Iſa.* 53. 6. — *The Lord*
aid on him the iniquity of us all,
2 *Cor.* 5. 21. *He made him to be*

ſin for us, who knew no ſin.

(3.) He became alſo one with, u*in a myſtical and ſpiritual ſenſe*, on with us as head to members *Eph.* 1. 22, 23. One with us a husband to wife, *Eph.* 5. 31, 32 And one with us as King to Subjects. Now as a husband may b juſtly ſued for his wives debt; an if the hand offend the head ma be *ſmitten.* So is Chriſt withou any unrighteouſneſs impleadabl for our ſins.

5. That the inducements mov ing to ſuch a tranſaction be weigh ty and conſiderable: It is not f that the criminal himſelf ſhoul be releaſed, nor that an innocen perſon ſhould be ſubſtituted i his room, but upon a cauſe that i momentous and great. There fore do Hiſtorians juſtifie the *De cii* in devoting themſelves to death in that it was for the preſervatio of the Commonwealth. Now there were moſt important rea

ſon

ns for the transfering our guilt
on Christ, and exacting satis-
ction at his hand.

(1.) Because otherwise the
hole race of mankind had been
terly lost. In the fall of Angels
ere was only a certain number
at sinned, millions being preser-
d in their obedience to God, and
condition of blessed enjoying of
m. But in the fall of man the
hole race was involved. not so
uch as one of the whole kind
ould have ever come to the frui-
on of God; and besides God
ould have mist that, which was
rt of his end in the creating of
em, *viz.* active glory in a way of
anksgiving and praise. Now
ough their was no necessity arose
om hence upon God, but that
e might have left them in their
and misery; yet there was a
eat agreeableness in it to the Di-
ne wisdom, that a whole species
rational creatures should not

be loſt; but that as there we
ſome of the Angels who ſtood
give God the active glory of h
perfections and works; ſo ſom
of fallen mankind ſhould be rec
vered to joyn forever with the
in that employment.

(2.) Becauſe otherwiſe God ha
loſt the opportunity of glorifyi
his mercy and grace. God in th
creation of the world had glorifi
ed his power, wiſdom, and boun
ty; and in the preterition of falle
Angels, he had glorified his holi
neſs and vindictive juſtice; Now
without the recovering of falle
man, his mercy and grace had no
been equally honored and mani
feſted with his other properties
And it is obſervable, that there i
no one attribute of God's nature
by which he loveth and chuſeth to
make himſelf more known, the
goodneſs, clemency, and mercy.
Exod. 34. 6, 7. 2 *Chron.* 30. 9. *Pſal.*
86. 5, 15. and 3. 4. and *alibi.*

(3.) Be

(3.) Becauſe otherwiſe all religion had been neceſſarily extinguiſh'd in diſpair. It is not poſſible to ſerve God without hope of reward, *Heb.* 11. 6. Had man been unavoidably left obnoxious to wrath he would through deſpair have reſigned himſelf to all ſin and villany; being left equally hopeleſs with the devils, he would have been as oppoſite to the love and obedience of God as they. Now it was very becoming the Divine wiſdome, that obedience and ſervice ſhould not utterly periſh from the earth.

6. *The laſt thing needful to render ſuch a tranſaction juſt is, that the honor of the tranſactors be heightned, at leſt ſecured by the tranſaction.* It were no ways conſonant either to wiſdom or righteouſneſs, to allow the interpoſure of a ſidejuſſor or ſubſtitute, if more could be had by retaining the offendor. But now by the exacting ſatisfaction

from Christ as our Surety, the glory of the perfections of God's nature, the honour of his law and government are much more enhanced, than if God should have inflicted punishment personally upon us. *First*, for his Law, that is honored both in the precept, and threatning of it; Christ having both fulfilled the command and born the curse: whereas had God confined himself to the sinner, he had forever lost the honour of the obedience of his law, and could have only honoured his threatning. 2*ly*. For the properties of his nature. (1.) Had he detained the offendor, he had compassed only the honour of his justice, but he had miss the glory of his grace: His justice indeed had been conspicuous, but his mercy had never come in view. He had rendred himself dreadful and terrible to his creatures, but not endeared, whereas now he hath

given

given evidence and demonſtration of it to the utmoſt, 1 *John* 4. 10. *Eph.* 2. 4, 5, 6, 7. (2.) For his juſtice, though it had been enough that it did not ſuffer through the the releaſing the offendor, yet it is moreover exalted above whatever it could have been, had God reſolved on the deſtruction of the ſinner. (1.) Had he executed the puniſhment upon us, his juſtice had been glorified only paſſively, but by inflicting it upon Chriſt, it is glorified not only paſſively, but alſo actively. Chriſt loved the Majeſty of God at the ſame time he ſatisfied his Juſtice, but the damned while under the effects of God's juſtice, they hate both it and his holineſs: The voluntary ſufferings of Chriſt do infinitely more honour the juſtice of God, than the forced torments of the ungodly can. (2.) In that had he confined himſelf to the ſinner, his juſtice ſhould never have been ſatisfied.

tisfied. The damned are alwise paying their debt, but yet never pay it. Now Christ hath satisfied to the full. (3.) In that justice hath not only all its demands, but is obliged with a surplusage; he that was our creditor, is become our debtor; there is more honor ariseth to God from Christ's sufferings, than he suffered dishonor by our sins. 3*ly*. For his wisdom, how wonderfully is that display'd in the whole transaction? the debt pay'd, and yet the debtor forgiven; sin punished, and yet the sinner acquitted: God at once infinitely righteous, and withal gracious. Death submitted to, yet conquered, *&c.* See *Eph.* 1. 8. *Eph.* 3. 10. and as the Father is honoured through this transaction, so is the Son; hereby he gives demonstration of his love to mankind, *Rev.* 1. 5. is rewarded for his sufferings with a numerous seed, *Isa.* 53. 10, 11. And in recompence for his

depreſſion and humiliation, he hath a name given him above every name, *Phil.* 2. 7, 8, 9. *Eph.* 1. 21, 22. and to overweigh his croſs and ſhame, he is crowned with dignity, honour, and glory, *Heb.* 2. 9.

Having thus far cleared our way, by demonſtrating that it is not againſt juſtice for one to be made ſuffer for anothers ſin, and having opened what conditions are neceſſary to render ſuch a tranſaction righteous, and that they all meet in the affair before us. Before we come to the proof of Chriſt his having ſuffered what we ſhould have ſuffered, we deſire further to premiſe theſe three things.

1. *We are to diſtinguiſh what is eſſential in the puniſhment, from what only is accidental in it*, what it includes in its own nature from what enſueth through the weakneſs of the ſubject. If we conſider only

only what is absolutely included in the threatning, we shall find no more but this, namely, that the sinner ought to undergo, both as to sense and loss as much as it is possible for a creature to bear. The law principally eyes the quality and the weight of the punishment, not so much the duration and continuance. The living and dying in Prison is no part of a man's debt, neither is that the primary intention of the law towards any, yet this comes justly to be his lot, that will not, or cannot pay his debt. That which lyes then formally in the threatning *is death*, Rom. 6. 23. *wrath*, Rom. 2. 5. *and the curse* Gal. 3. 10. but that this is eternal, ariseth meerly from the finitenes and weaknes of the creature: If a sinner could at once bear that which is proportionable and equal in justice to his crime, and by so doing make satisfaction, there might in time be an end of his

punish-

punishment, but this he cannot do, and therefore must suffer forever according to what he is capable of bearing. Now Christ was to undergo only what was formally in the threatning, to bear the weight of it, and having by bearing of it made satisfaction, he was no ways concerned in the eternity and duration of the punishment, justice it self discharging him, the debt being pay'd.

2. *we must distinguish betwixt those effects which flow naturally from suffering, and those which through the corruption of the party punished, flow only accidentally from it.* If the Socinians would be pleased to take notice of this, they would ease us the trouble of that thread-bare objection, *viz.* that in case Christ underwent the punishment of the law, he behoved to dispair and blaspheme, forasmuch as these do not flow naturally from suffering, but proceed

meerly from the corruption and imbecillity of those that suffer. A person may undergo punishment, without either murmuring at the Judge who sentenceth him, or reproaching the law by which he is condemned. The blasphemy of a damned sinner ariseth in way of causation meerly from his own corruption, his pains are at most but occasional of it; and while he had mercies they issued in the like effects. For the dispair of a damned person, it proceeds hence, that he knows he shall never make satisfaction, nor extricate himself from under what he feels. Now it was not possible, that either of these should fall upon Christ; not the first, seeing he was perfectly holy in his nature, without any principle of or inclination to sin: Not the second, in that he knew himself able to make God a satisfaction, and foresaw, and believed a glorious issue from all his pains.

3. *we*

3. *we muſt make a difference betwixt thoſe ſufferings which were directly in the threatning, and thoſe that were only conſequentially in it.* Thoſe, that the humane nature may be made obnoxious to, though it be holy and innocent; and thoſe that follow the humane nature, as exiſting only in our ſinful perſons. Chriſt aſſumed only the common nature of man, and not the perſon of any man; and therefore was neither ſubject to paſſionate diſorders of mind, nor painful ſickneſſes of body; ſeeing theſe do not appertain to the eſſence of the humane nature, but only attend it as it exiſts in our ſinful perſons.

Theſe things being premiſed, I come now to prove that Chriſt hath ſuffered what we ſhould have ſuffered; and that the ſame penalty which was due to us was inflicted on him: the death and curſe which the law denounced

againſt

against the ſinner, Chriſt as the Surety bore.

The puniſhment which was due to us conſiſted of two parts, death and the curſe to be inflicted upon us; and the favour of God to be ſuſpended and withdrawn from us.

1. That which was expreſly denounced, as the penalty of ſin was death and the curſe, *Gen.* 2. 17. *Deut.* 27. 26. *Rom* 6. 23. *Rom.* 5. 12. *Gal.* 3. 10. And this, and no leſs; this very puniſhment, and not an other did Chriſt undergo: the ſame ſentente of the law, which ſhould have been executed upon us, was executed upon him. There was a change of perſons, the Surety ſuffering for the Debtor, the juſt for the unjuſt; but no change of puniſhment at all. *Chriſt taſted death*, Heb. 2 9. *was put to death*, Joh. 18. 31, 32. *became obedient unto death, even the death of the Croſs*, Phil. 2. 8. *bore the curſe*, Gal.

Gal. 3. 13. *Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us.* The Apostle having asserted in the 10. *verse*, that every person who continues not in all things, which are written in the Book of the Law to do them, is cursed: He here opens how believers, notwithstanding that commination, come to be freed from the curse; namely, because Christ hath born it; and for the proof of this, he refers them to *Deut.* 21. 23. where they were taught so much. Κατάρα, *Execratio*, a Curse, the abstract for the concrete (as is usual in Scripture, see the Texts in the Margin) that is, he underwent all the wrath which the law denounced; particularly, that death to which it only affixed the curse. By curse we may either understand the sentence of the law execrating and condemning the sinner, which is called the curse actively, or we may understand

2 Cor. 3. 9. and 5. 21 Eph. 5. 8. John 17. 17. Rom. 3. 30.

the execution of puniſhment according to that ſentence which is the curſe paſſively; for in both reſpects Chriſt was made a curſe. I would have well obſerved here, that though hanging was reckoned always an ignominious kind of death, yet that it alone was an accurſed death, aroſe meerly from the conſtitution of the Law-maker, and the declaration of the Law. Whatever malefactors were hanged before the enacting and proclaiming of this Law, we have no ground to believe that they were accurſed; and originally the curſe was ceremonial, being intended by God as a type of the moral curſe, which Chriſt was to bear. *Suſpenſus, ſecundum legem ceremonialem eſt execrationi Deo: nam alioqui neque ſecundum naturæ legem, nec ſecundum jura civilia, neque per ſeipſum denique, qui ſuſpenſus eſt, Deo execrabilis*, Jun. Paral. ll. l. 2. And here the providence

dence of God is very obſervable, that whereas ſuſpenſion was not any o the capital puniſhments preſcribed by *Moſes*, neither was it the cuſtome of the Jews to puniſh their malefactors with that kind of death, Chriſt ſhould dye by a Romane and not a Judaical law. It is true, that ſome after they were ſtoned to death, were ſometimes for the enormity of their fact, put to the ignominy of the Gibbet, but otherwiſe it was no Judaick puniſhment; and had Chriſt been executed according to a Moſaick law, he could not have been Crucified. But among the *Romans*, it was a death to which they often uſed to put Traitors, Thieves, Murderers, and Seditious perſons. *Authores Seditionis aut tumultus, pro qualitatis dignitate, aut in crucem tolluntur, aut beſtiis objiciuntur*, Paulus. l. 5. tit. 22. Now Chriſt being condemned by *Pilate* upon accuſation of affecting

Deut 21. 22. And he be to be put to death, and thou hang him on a Tree; ought to be read, and he be put to death, and thou hang him on a Tree; See *Grot.* and *Fag.* on the place.

the Soveraignty, disturbing the Nation, and being an enemy to *Cæsar*, Luc. 23. 2. *Joh.* 19. 12. underwent the death of the Cross, which was the *Roman* punishment for these crimes. *Crucem autem irrogatam Christo, tanquam seditionis auctori verissimè à multis notatum est. eam enim pœnam ei crimini statuunt Romanæ leges*, Grot. in Mat. 27. And as of all deaths itwas the most painful and shameful, *summum supplicium*, Paul. in Sentent. *Extrema pœna*, Apul. *Servile supplicium*, Tacit. *Pone crucem servo*, Juven. So over all these there was in the death of Christ the curse of the law, and the wrath of God. And this, together with the apprehension and sense of the withdrawment of his Fathers love (of which more anone) was the rise of that grief and horrour in the soul of Christ, which the Holy Ghost by the several Evangelists so largely expresseth.

His

His ſoul was exceeding ſorrowful, Mat. 26. 38. περίλυπος, *undequaque triſtis*, Bez. It ſignifies the ſoul ſurrounded and encompaſſed with an exceſs of ſorrow, beſet with grief round about. The ſoul depreſſed and bowed under dejection of mind, the Holy Ghoſt ſeems to have reſpect to *Pſal.* 116. 3. *The ſorrows of death compaſſed me, and the pains of hell got hold upon me: I found trouble and ſorrow.* See alſo *Pſal.* 22. 14. *Mark* expreſſeth it, *He began to be ſore amaZed and very heavy*, Mar. 14. 33. ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι, it ſignifies an high degree of horrour and amazement, *Medici vocant horripilationem*, when the hair ſtands up through fear, καὶ ἀδημονεῖν. *Gravißimè angebatur*, Bez. It implies much fear attended with reſtleſſeneſs and anxiety of mind: *Præ mœrore pene concidere animo.* *John* expreſſeth it, *Now is my ſoul troubled*, Joh. 12. 27. τετάρακται, it ſignifieth great trouble through fear

or grief: *Hence* tartarus, *hell*, ὅτι τὰ ἄττει ἅπαντα, *quia terret omnia*, Luke *saith he was in an agony*, Luke 22. 44 ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ, it signifieth fear and commotion of mind, upon the feeling and foresight of evil and danger, yet not so as to be dispirited, or disheartned. From hence also proceeded his bloody sweat *ibid. his sweat was as it were great drops of blood.* Tears were not sufficient evidences of his inward sufferings, nor could the sorrows of his heart be vented enough at his eyes, but the innumer ble pores of his body must represent and speak the bitter anguish of his soul. There is no instance can parallel it: That a person under no distemper of body, who before hand had agreed to lay down his life, and was now willing to do it: A person perfectly innocent both in nature and life, under no accusation of conscience as to personal

guilt,

guilt, free from all ſolicitude in reference to the cares of the world, and certain of a Crown of Glory, ſhould be under ſuch anguiſh and conſternation; which clearly argues that it did not proceed from the conſideration of meer natural death, but from the ſenſe of Divine wrath, and the feeling of the curſe. There are two inſtances in *Thuanus*, which though very ſtrange yet do infinitely differ from this. *Dux quidam indigna mortis metu adeo conſuſſus animo fuit, ut ſanguineum ſudorem toto corpore fudit*, Hiſt. l. 11. *Juvenis ob levem cauſam à Sixto 5. ad mortem damnatus, præ doloris vehementia lachrymas cruentas fudiſſe, & ſanguinem pro ſudore, toto corpore mittere viſus eſt*, l. 80. I might alſo add, *That his ſtrong crys and tears* aroſe from the ſame ſpring, *Heb.* 5. 7. ἱκετηρίας. It denoteth a moſt ardent kind of praying: *Ardentior orandi forma,*

cum lachrymis, gemitu, aliisque geſtibus conjuncta. *Luke* expreſseth it, ἐκτενέστερον προσηύχετο, *he prayed more earneſtly.* To ſay that all this was only from a preapprehenſion of his bodily ſufferings, is a moſt irrational as well as a falſe ſuggeſtion; for what were this but to abaſe the valour and courage of Chriſt below that of thouſands of men, who have undauntedly, at leaſt with leſs conſternation, encountred death in its moſt terrible ſhapes. The ground then of all this anguiſh and agony which Chriſt was in, was his conflicting with Divine wrath, and the curſe of the law in death. There was not the leaſt change of the puniſhment in reference to the Surety, from what was denounced againſt the ſinner. The conſideration of this overthrows, Firſt, the Popiſh phanſie, of Chriſt his ſuffering formally only in his body, and in his ſoul only by

by way of ſimpathy; he ſuffered the very ſame that we ſhould have ſuffered, *i.e.* he ſuffered both in ſoul and body. *In neither did God ſpare him, but both gave him up to death, and made his ſoul an offering for ſin*, Rom. 8. 32. *Iſa.* 53. 8, 10. Secondly, It overthrows the phanſie of others, that if God had ſo pleaſed, one drop of the blood of Chriſt might have been a compenſation for our ſins; whereas ſeeing it was death, wrath, and the curſe which was in the threatning, nothing leſs could have made a ſatisfaction for ſin. It is a note of *Camero's*, *Dignitas perſonæ ἐπιτιθὶ ſatisfactionis detrahere nil poteſt, ἐπιτοῦ poteſt; ratio eſt, ἐπίτασις eſt ſatisfactioni eſſentialis, ἔντασις non eſt.*

2. The ſecond part of the curſe was ſeparation from God, and the ſenſe of the loſs of his favour, and this alſo Chriſt underwent, being for a time under the with-

withdrawment and loſs of the feeling of God's love So much was before hand propheſied concerning him, *Pſal.* 22. 1. and himſelf declareth that he bore it, *Mat.* 27. 46. *My God, my God, why haſt thou forſaken me?* It is true, he was not left as to the diſſolution of the perſonal union with the Divine Eſſence *Joh.* 14. 11. and 10. 30. *Heb.* 9. 14. nor as to the vertue and ſupport of God's power and providence, *Pſal.* 16. 8, 9 *Joh.* 16. 32. nor as to grace and ſanctification, *Col.* 1. 19. It was needful that he ſhould be always holy, otherwiſe he had failed in the work which he came about, but it was not needful that he ſhould be always joyful; yea, conſidering his undertaking, it was impoſſible that he ſhould be ſo: and therefore he was left only as to the communication of the effects of Divine love and favour, which is that which the damned with

lye under in hell. And this, with what I delivered under the former head, was the ground of his fear, agony, and bloody ſweat, &c. Having proved that Chriſt ſuffered the very ſame which we ſhould have ſuffered; it naturally follows, that he did it in way of a ſatisfaction, for there is no other reaſon imaginable, why God ſhould thus puniſh a perſon who in himſelf was altogether innocent, and one ſo dear to him as his own Son, but that he ſtood charged as a Surety with our ſins, to make ſatisfaction to Divine Juſtice for them.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

The ſatisfaction of Chriſt further eſtabliſhed, in that he ſuffered in our room. He underwent death as a penalty, our ſins were laid on him. He was made ſin, dyed for us, bare our iniquities.

THE next thing which comes under conſideration for the more full clearing, that Chriſt hath ſatisfied for us is this; that as he ſuffered the ſame which we ſhould have ſuffered, *ſo he ſuffered it all in our room and ſtead.* It was before hand told, *that the Meſſiah ſhould be cut off, but not for himſelf,* Dan. 9. 26. He was to be penally cut off, not upon his own account, or for himſelf, but for us. This particular will be fully made out by conſidering theſe five things.

1. *In that he underwent death, which God had conſtituted the puniſhment of ſin, and there being no cauſe*

uſe in himſelf why he ſhould ſuf-
r that penalty, It unavoidably
lows, that it was becauſe he ſtood
arged with our offences. I do not
ow diſpute, whether God might
ve made man obnoxious to
ath in caſe he had never ſinned,
e only queſtion is what he hath
one: I will not deny, but that
od having given us our beings
d lives, might without inju-
ice have taken back, what he
d given; he might in way of do-
inion and ſoveraignty have ſent
s into the world to act our parts
r a time, and then remanded us
to our ſtate of not being again;
e only queſtion is what he hath
one, and that in condecency to
is wiſdom, goodneſs, and righte-
uſneſs as governour of his crea-
ures; and here we affirm that
ath was appointed by God to be
e wages of ſin, and that if man
d not ſinned, he ſhould not have
yed, notwithſtanding the poſſibi-

lity

lity of dying, which was in ma
nature, he ſhould by the power
God have been preſerved fro
actual dying. Whatever he was ob
noxious to in the conſtitution
his nature, he ſhould for ever hav
been free from death in the even
And it was very conſonant to D
vine wiſdom and goodneſs, th
perfect righteouſneſs and puri
ſhould have been attended wi
life and immortality, and th
God ſhould not take away th
being which he had beſtowed
but upon a faileur in reference t
the end for which it was given
God appointed death to be th
puniſhment of ſin, *Gen.* 2. 17. *I*
the day that thou eateſt thereof, th
ſhalt ſurely dye. This being d
nounced only in caſe of ſin, w
are thence fully informed, that i
man had not ſinned he ſhould no
have dyed. To this it were eaſi
to ſubjoyn many other places o
Scripture, *Rom.* 6. 23. *The wage*

of ſin is death. Rom. 5. 12. *Death entred into the world by ſin.* It came not in as a conſequent of the frailty of humane nature, but as the demerit of the fall. Hence death is called an *enemy*, 1 Cor. 15. 26. *God made not death*, ſaith the Apocryphal writer. Now Jeſus Chriſt having ſuffered death, which was the puniſhment of ſin, and having had no ſin of his own for which he could be puniſhed, it reſults by a neceſſary conſequence, that he ſuffered death as the penalty of our ſins, and as he ſtood in our room.

Object. *But poſſibly it may be objected, that this interferes with our own doctrine. For if death be the penalty of ſin, then foraſmuch as Chriſt by bearing the penalty hath delivered us from every thing that is penal, he ſhould have delivered us from death too, but not having delivered us from death, we contradict our ſelves in calling death the puniſhment of ſin.* Anſw.

Obj.

Answ. I. *Answer*, All those for whom Christ hath satisfied, are delivered by him from death, so far as it is penal: So that though it be continued, yet it is not as it is punishment, but in order to other ends; sin and the curse being separate from it, it is no more poisonous but medicinal. Instead of a punishment, it is become a priviledge. *Christ having unstung it, and swallowed up the curse which was in it*, 1 *Cor.* 15. 54, 55. it cannot hurt them, though it seise them. Instead of being an inlet to wrath, it is an entrance to glory.

2. *Christ his suffering in our room, will be made further out, if we consider that our sins were laid on him*, Isa. 53, 6, 7. *The Lord laid on him the iniquity of us all; he was oppressed, and he was afflicted.* That it is the Messiah and none other, who is intended throughout that whole Chapter hath

hath been abundantly justified a-
gainst the Jews: and it is utterly
impossible with any congruity and
sense to apply it to any other. And
several testimonies taken hence are
in the New Testament expressly ap-
plyed to Christ, *ver.* 1. *Joh.* 12,
37, 38. *ver.* 4. *Mat.* 8. 17. *ver.*
7, 8. *Act.* 8. 28. *ad* 36. *ver.* 12.
Luke 22. 37. The attempts of
Grotius in accommodating the
whole to *Jeremiah*, have been a-
bundantly refuted by *Hoornbeck*,
Alex. Morus, and the learned Dr.
Owen, to whose writings I profess
my self more beholding for a clear
understanding of some things in
the mystery of the Gospel, than to
any mans besides. Taking then at
present for granted, that it is to be
understood of the Messiah: Is it
possible that we should desire, in
reference to the affair in hand, a
text either more plain or full? *He
laid on him the iniquities of us all.*
The word is וַיהוָה *hiphgiang*,

from the root פגע *pahang*. No
פגע signifieth properly to mee
and therefore ויפגע must signif
he made to meet. They were
made to meet on him, that
bore them *ver.* 11. It were no
sense to render the words, *T*
Lord made him to intercede the i
quity of us all upon him. It
true, the word is sometimes
translated, where the subject ma
ter requires it, as *Jer.* 7, 16. b
neither Grammar nor context w
allow it to be so here. See *ver.*
5, 10. *He hath born our griefs, a*
carried our sorrows —— *he w*
wounded for our transgressions,
was bruised for our iniquities. Go
doth not remit sin only in favo
of his Son at his intreaty, as Kin
sometimes pardon Malefactors
the earnest request of a favourit
No, Christ prayed that if m
without his death could have be
saved, the Cup might pass fro
him, *Mat.* 26. 39. but it wou
no

not do; they were so laid on him, that God exacted of him a satisfaction for them: *He was oppressed and he was afflicted*, so we render it: but it might be better rendred, *It was exacted*, and he answered. how נגש *nagas*, *with sin*, *signifieth to exact and require*; and how ענה *naaneh*, signifieth to *answer*, as well as to be *afflicted*, and how translated either ways, it admirably establisheth the satisfaction of Christ; see our Annotators on the place. That Christ was to suffer, through having our sins laid on him, was the faith of the Old Testament Church, typified in their imposition of hands upon, and confession of sin over the head of the sacrifice, *Levit. 16. 21. Levit 5, 5, 6.* Their confessing of sin over the sacrifice, and their laying their hands on it, was both to signifie their earnest desire that their sins might be taken off from them, and laid on the sacrifice, and

How far the Heathen did imitate them, see *Herodot. lib 2, c. 29* and *Plutarch in Iside.*

that the punishment which was due to them might be upon it: *Quicquid à me peccatum est, sit in hujus victimæ caput*; i. e. *pœnam peccato commeritam ab illa reposcat Deus*: As also a profession of their faith in Christ, as the true sacrifice to be slain for sin, and that the present sacrifice was only a type thereof. And this for the second consideration, for the confirming that what Christ suffered, he suffered in our room and stead.

3. *That Christ suffered in our room, and as being charged with our sins, will be yet more fully established, if we take notice of that of the Apostle, he was made sin for us*, 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. *He hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin.* Now sin is either to be taken *properly* or *metonymically*; metonymically, either by a metonymie of the cause for the effect, *Isa* 53. 12. *He bore the sin of many*, i. e. the punishment, 1 *Pet.* 2. 24. *Who*

his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, i. e. The punishment of our sins in his body, *Gen.* 4. 13. *My punishment is greater than I can bear*, so we render it; but in the Hebrew, *It is my iniquity is greater*, &c. See also *Gen.* 19. 15. *Zech.* 14. 19. or else by a metonymie of the adjunct for the subject; sin put to denote a sacrifice for sin, *Levit.* 4. 29. and 5. 9. and elsewhere frequently in that book, we render it sin offering, but in the Hebrew it is sin. See also *Hos.* 4. 8. *Isa.* 53. 10. *When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin*; so we read it, but it is in the Hebrew *trespass* or *sin*. Now whether we pitch upon either of these or both, the Text proves this much, that Christ who had no sin of his own to suffer for, suffered the punishment that was due to ours; he that had no crime of his own to expiate, became a sacrifice of expiation for our crimes.

Or if you will take sin here properly, as the context by stating sin in opposition to righteousness, seems to incline it. *Non per tropum est explicandum, sed potius sumendum est, pro ut oppositio monstrat.* Walth. Then the import will be, that Christ who had no sin in his nature, nor committed any in his life; who in a moral sense was altogether free from sin, was yet in a judicial sense made sin. Our iniquities were charged upon him, and satisfaction exacted of him for them, as if they had been his own. *Lutherus non male Christum nominavit maximum peccatorem.* It is a most frivolous cavil of the Socinians, that Christ his being made sin, signifieth no more than that the world esteemed of him, and treated him as a sinner. *Sinit eum tractari tanquam sceleroſum*, Grot. in loc. Wonderfully betraying the truth, even after he had once defended it.

There

There might have been some plea for this exception, if it had been he was accounted sin, or if it had been man made him to be sin: But as (1.) they can hardly shew that to be made sin, is in all the Scripture of the same intendment with being esteemed a sinner, much less (2.) can they shew that to be made sin by God, should be ever used to imply the being reputed a sinner by men. (3.) That this cannot be the meaning, the next words put out of question; *For we are made the righteousness of God*, is not that the world holds us for righteous, but that in a law sense we are constituted as righteous through Christ, as God either desires or can require: So is being made sin is not that the world esteemed him a sinner, or that God suffered him to be treated by the world as a sinner; but the intendment is that he was really, and in a judicial sense cha-

ed with our ſins, and that what-
ever the law made the puniſhmen
of them he bore.

4. *Chriſt his ſuffering in o*
room and ſtead, will be furth
ſtrengthned by conſidering thoſe e
preſſions and places, in which it
expreſly affirmed that he died f
our ſins, and that he ſuffered for
There are four prepoſitions the Ho
ly Ghoſt uſeth to this purpoſe
that if one be more emphatic
that another they may all conſpi
to juſtifie this truth. Firſt, *o*
Rom. 4. 24. *Who was delivered f*
our offences; this particle joyn
with an accuſative doth general
ſignifie the impulſive cauſe, a
not the final. See *Mat.* 10.
and 13. 5. and 14. 9. *Joh.* 20.
2 *Cor.* 4. 11. and particularly wh
uſed in reference to ſufferings,
hath that ſignification and
other, ſee *Levit.* 16. 18, 28. *De*
28. 11. 2 *Kings* 23. 26. *Jer.*
22. *Joh.* 10. 32. in all th
pla

places it necessarily signifies the meritorious and impulsive cause, and no wise the final. And so in the foregoing place διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν, for our offences must needs be understood that our offences were the meritorious and impulsive cause of Christ's suffering. Another particle that the Holy Ghost useth, is ὑπὲρ, *Rom. 6. 8. For when we were yet without strength Christ died for the ungodly*, Rom. 8. 32. *He spared not his own Son, but delivered him up to death for us all*. 1 Pet. 3. 18. *Christ hath once suffered — the just for the unjust*, Tit. 2. 14. *who gave himself for us* — 1 Tim. 2. 6. *who gave himself a ransome for all*, Heb. 2. 9. *he tasted death for every man*, Joh. 10. 15. *I lay down my life for my sheep*, Luke 22. 19, 20. *This is my body which is given for you* — *This Cup is the New Testament in my blood which is shed for you*. Now the particle ἀντὶ among other

other significations that it hath, signifieth sometimes the impulsive cause, *Phil.* 2. 13. *Eph.* 5. 20. *Rom.* 15. 9. Sometimes the substitution of one in the room of another, 2 *Cor.* 5. 20. *Philem.* v. 13. μᾶλλον δ' ἐγὼ τοῦδ' ὑπὲρ σοῦ ποιοῦμαι. Demost. *Ego pro te molam*, Terent. Particularly when the sufferings of one for another is expresst by it, it always signifieth the substitution of one in the place of another, *Rom.* 9. 3. ἠυξάμην ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ. Eurip. *Unum pro multis dabitur caput.*

Virg. *Hunc tibi Eryx meliorem animam pro morte Daretis*
Persolvo.

When ever it's used to imply ones dying for another, it always signifieth the dying in his stead. Another Preposition made use of in this affair is περὶ 1 *Pet.* 3. 18 *Christ also hath once suffered for sins*, Gal. 1. 4. *who gave himself for*

our

our sins, 1 Joh. 2. 2. *and he is the propitiation for our sins.* Now this particle though it hath several significations according as the subject matter requires, yet among others it often signifyeth the impulsive cause, *Luke* 19. 37. *Joh.* 10. 33. especially when it refers to sufferings, *Jud.* 15. The last particle made use of to this purpose is *viz. Mat.* 20. 28. *even as the Son of Man came to give his life a ransome for many.* Repeated again *Mark* 10. 45. Now this Preposition when ever applyed to persons or things, it always imports a substituting of one in the room of another, or an exchanging of one for another, *Mat.* 2. 22. *Mat.* 5. 38. and 17. 27. *Luke* 11. 11. *Rom.* 12. 17. 1 *Cor.* 11. 15. 1 *Pet.* 3. 9. So that from the whole we may confidently conclude that Christ not only suffered for our good, but in our room and stead.

5. *That Christ dyed not only for*

our

our advantage and profit, but in a
place, will be fully demonstrated,
we observe that he is said to ha
born our sins, 1 *Pet.* 2. 24. *who h*
own self bare our sins in his o
body on the tree, Heb. 9. 28. *Chr*
was once offered to bear the sins
many, ἀνενεγκεῖν *he carried up our si*
on his body on the tree; they wer
made to ascend on him. Now t
bear sin is usually in the Scriptur
phrase to bear the punishment o
sin, *Levit.* 5. 1. and 7. 18. and 20
27. *Numb.* 14. 33. *Exod.* 28. 43
Ezek. 28. 20. and 23. 49. and 18
20. *Lament.* 5. 7. And though i
should be granted that to bear si
sometimes signifieth only to re
move sin, yet that this is not the sole
meaning of it in reference to Christ
his bearing sin, the Holy Ghost puts
out of question, *Isa.* 53. 4, 5, 8,
10. *He hath born our griefs, and*
carried our sorrows, —— *he was*
wounded for our transgressions —
for the transgression of my people
was

as he striken —— *he shall bear their iniquities.* The two words which the Holy Ghost there useth are נשא *nasa*, and סבל *saball*; now though נשא signifies sometimes only to take away, *Job* 7. 21. and to forgive, *Exod.* 34. 7. *Num.* 14. 18. *Psal.* 32. 1. yet סבל signifieth ever to bear, or carry a burthen by taking it on, nor is it once used otherwise in all the Scriptures. And besides, however נשא in other places may be allowed to signifie only to remove or take away; yet that it should signifie so here, the context will not admit, *In that it is said he bore our sins so, as to be wounded for them, grieved, bruised, chastised, and put to pain for them,* which clearly shews the ground and cause of his sufferings, and not only the issue and the event.

Object. *But it is objected, that this of the Prophet of Christ his bearing our diseases is applied,* Mat. 8.

8. 16, 17. in reference to Christ
healing of diseases, and the
fore if the bearing our sickness
be only his removing of them by
ring them, in like manner
bearing our sins is not the taki
them upon himself to undergo the
nishment of them, but only his taki
them away by forgiveness and he
ing.

To this I return these things
way of Answer. (1.) It may
denyed that Christ his bearing o
diseases, is to be understood on
in reference to his removing
them; but that it imports also h
travelling under them as a bu
then. He had a fellow feeling
the pains and griefs he cured
was affected and afflicted under t
sense of them, as if they had be
his own, *Heb.* 4. 15. besides
underwent great trouble, pain, a
travel in the curing of them.
much at least is implyed in t
word ἐβάστασεν. *Est in hac voce*

quedam & molestiæ significantia, Grot. *Nuspiam non portare significat, & bajulare*, vid. *Mat.* 3. 11. and 20. 12. *Mat.* 14. 13. *Luke* 7. 14. and 10. 4. and 14. 27. *Job.* 19. 17. and 20. 15. *Acts* 15. 10. *Rom.* 15. 1. *Gal.* 6. 5. *Rev.* 2. 3.

(2.) We meet with a great deal more in Scripture to induce us to believe that Christ bare our sins by taking them upon him, than that he bare our diseases by taking them upon him; for our sins are said to have been laid on him, *Isa.* 53. 6. and he is said to have been made sin for us, 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. whereas we do not read that our infirmities were laid on him, or that he was made blind, or lame, *&c.* for us.

(3.) A Scripture may be alleged to be fulfilled, not only when the thing foretold and principally intended comes to pass, but when something like it falls out: when there is only an allusion or accommoda-

modation to the Prophesie, though in the primary and literal meaning of it, there be something else intended; though there be but one literal & coordinate sense of Scripture, yet there may be divers senses of several kinds one subordinate to another. Compare *Psal.* 78. 2. with *Mat.* 13. 35. *Isa.* 29. 13. with *Mat.* 15. 7, 8. *Jer.* 7. 11. with *Mat.* 21. 13. *Isa.* 1. 9. with *Rom.* 9. 29.

(4.) A Scripture may be said to be fulfilled, either when that which is chiefly designed is brought forth, or when that which only typifies and represents the other comes to pass. Many things in Scripture are spoken of the type, which principally belong to the Antitype, see 2 *Sam.* 7. 14. compared with *Heb.* 1. 5. and *Hos.* 1. 11. with *Mat.* 2. 15. and *Jer.* 31. 15. with *Mat.* 2. 16. 17, 18. Now Christ his healing of bodily diseases, being a type of his curing the diseases of the soul, therefore the Holy Ghost applies

harwhich firſtly and chiefly be-
ngs to the one, to the other, that
they might not look on Chriſt
s a meer bodily Phyſitian, but ra-
er as one whoſe work and end
was to heal their ſouls, where-
f the curing the infirmities of
eir bodies was only a type and
mbol, ſee *Mat.* 8. 2.

(5.) A Scripture may be ſaid
be fulfilled, when the accom-
liſhment of it is demonſtrated
the effects. *Multa fieri dicun-
r, quando facta eſſe intelliguntur,*
e *Pſal.* 2. 7. with *Acts* 13. 32, 33.
hriſt in the day of his reſurrecti-
n is ſaid to be begotten of the
ather, becauſe he was then moſt
idently ſhown to be the Son of
od. So *Jam.* 2. 21. *Abraham*
the offering of his Son *Iſaac* is
id to be juſtified by works, be-
uſe that great work gave demon-
ration of his being juſtified. Now
hriſt his taking away bodily di-
mpers, being an evidence of his

raking away sins, which is done b
bearing of them; therefore th
which the Prophet spake in ref
rence to the cause, the Evangeli
applies in reference to the effe
So that having dispatched this ob
jection, we presume to conclud
from the whole of what hath be
offered, that as Christ suffered th
same penalty which was due to us
so he suffered it in our room an
stead, and as a satisfaction an
compensation to God's justice fo
our sins.

CHAP. VII.

*The satisfaction of Christ further esta
lished, from his having redeemed
The import of the word. A ranso
paid for us. Accepted of God, a
thereupon we set free.*

THat Jesus Christ hath ma
satisfaction for our sins wi
further

ther appear, or in the next place
consider, that he hath effected
d accomplished what in other cases
eth to be the effects and results of a
isfaction; namely, he hath re-
med us from the wrath and curse
which we were obnoxious. To
deem in the general import of
e word, is either to deliver from
ndage and misery, through the
ervention of a price; or to re-
ue out of a state of slavery
rough force and power. In this
ter sence the deliverance of
ael out of *Egypt* is often called
demption, *Exod.* 15. 13. *Deut.*
8, and 9. 26. and 13. 5. and 21. 8.
l. 77. 15. and in many places
sides. And *Moses* having been
nally employed in that affair is
led λυτρωτὴς, deliverer, *Acts* 7.
. and let this be observed by the
y, that as the redemption of
e people from the bondage of
ypt was typical of the Redem-
ion from the wrath of God; so

it is called redemption, not so much from the general nature of *deliverance*, as from the *respect* it had to the redemption to be wrought by Christ, whereof it was a *type*. And besides, as the temporal deliverance from the *Egyptian* bondage, was typical of the spiritual redemption from the curse; so there was a *typical price* exacted and paid suitable to the typical redemption, to point to *the real and proper price* which Christ was to pay for our proper and spiritual redemption. And in reference to this it is that Christ is called our *Passover*, 1 *Cor.* 5. 7. and as they were redeemed from temporal wrath, and typically reconciled to God by the blood of the Paschal Lamb, so we are redeemed from eternal wrath, and really reconciled to God by the blood of Christ, who is therefore called *the Lamb of God*, Joh. 1 29. *and a Lamb without spot and blemish* 1 *Pet.* 1. 18, 19.

But to redeem in its first and most proper intendment, signifies by the payment and solution of a price and ransome to set free.

Quid agas? nisi ut redimas te captum quam queas minimo, si nequeas paululo ac quanti queas, Terent.

Si fratrem Pollux alterna morte redemit, Virg.

Now one may be in bondage, either as a Debtor to a Creditor, or as a Criminal to a Governour and Ruler; he that is in Prison on the first foot of account, must continue so, unless satisfaction be made by the payment of the summ of which he stands charged; and he that is detained on the second account, is not to expect deliverance, unless the penalty be undergone, to which his offence hath rendred him obnoxious. And those who upon other terms come to be free, cannot properly be said

to be redeemed, but only to be re-leased.

Having stated the significatio of the word before I come to prove, that Christ through the payment of a price hath in a proper sense redeemed us; I desire to premise these three things.

1. *That we stood obnoxious to God's fiery indignation and wrath.* His law we had broken, and by his sentence we stood condemned: *It is his judgment, that they who commit sin are worthy of death.* Δικαίωμα, God's constitution and appointment. The precept of the law being broken, we lay liable to the curse as the penalty of it, *Gal.* 3. 10. Divine Justice had made us prisoners, *Isa.* 61. 1. and we were subject to Satan as God's jaylor, and without payment there was to be no deliverance.

2. *That as we had forfeited the favour of God, and were become subject to his wrath, so we had lost his image,*

image, and were fettered in our own lusts. Therefore as we were to be redeemed from the justice and wrath of God, so we were to be set free from the dominion and power of corruption; as a Captive delivered from the penalty of the law, is also released from his prison and irons; and as the delivery of a Traitor from the wrath of the Goverhour, and sentence of the law, is the primary and principal thing intended in redemption, and the looſing of him from his fetters and jayl; follows as consequential and secondary upon that: So Christ having as the chief end of his suffering, satisfied the justice of God, and redeemed us from his wrath, he hath through a redundancy of merit, which was in his blood consequentially purchased grace for us, and set us free from the power of our corruption. Hence as he is said to have redeemed us from the curse

of the law, *Gal.* 3. 13. ſo he like-wiſe is ſaid to have redeemed u from iniquity, and from our vai converſation, *Tit.* 2. 14. 1 *Pet.* 1. 18

3. *we muſt diſtinguiſh betwix pecuniary debts and penal, betwix a meer Creditor and a Governour* In pecuniary debts ſomething ma terial is paid and received, b which the Creditor is made rich er: In penal, it is enough that th Law be ſatisfied, though the Go vernour be not formally made th richer. A perſon that is wronge may account himſelf ſatisfied, i the party who hath offended hin hazard his life for him, though h formally pay him nothing. S here it was not needful that Go ſhould properly receive any thing it was enough that he ſhould ac cept what was done. To mak good God's acceptance of th price, it is ſufficient that his law i ſatisfied, and that his juſtice ſuf fered not by the delivery of th

ſinner

ſinner, though he be not formally made the richer; and this is not only true that the juſtice of God ſuffers nothing by our releaſe, *Rom.* 3. 25. but beſides, it is more glorified, than it could have been in the deſtruction of the ſinner.

Theſe things being premiſed, we come now to prove that Chriſt, by the interpoſition of his blood as a price, hath properly in way of ſolution and payment redeemed and delivered us. And this will appear if we conſider theſe three things.

1. *If we obſerve that there was a price paid*; and this the Scripture fully informs us, 1 *Cor.* 6. 20. *for ye are bought with a price*; and what this price was, we are expreſly told, 1 *Pet.* 1. 18, 19. *Ye are not redeemed with ſilver and gold — but with the precious blood of Chriſt, as of a Lamb without blemiſh and without ſpot.* Of what uſe ſilver and gold are in other caſes

cases to redeeme captives, of that use is the blood of Christ to redeem sinners. Hence Christ's death is called a ransome, *Mat.* 20. 28. *He gave his life a ransome for many*, λύτρον. it is all one whether it come from λύω to loose, or λύω to pay. As we were held prisoners by the law and justice of God, we are by this λύτρον redeemed and set free. The Antient Jews used to stile the Messiah ἄνδρα λύτρου. It is not improbable that the Romans derived their *lustrum* from λύτρον, when many were delivered from destruction by one or more suffering, to purifie and expiate the sin of the rest. *Hinc Decii dicuntur lustrasse Romanum exercitum.* Now Christ was such a λύτρον, instead of many. Hence he is stiled ἀντίλυτρον, 1 *Tim.* 2. 6. *Quum alius solvit, quod reus non poterat*, Aret. *Est tale pretium in quo liberator simile quid subit ei malo quod ei imminebat qui liberatur,*

Grot. in *Mat.* 28. 20.

tur, Scult. It signifieth a counterprice, that which one undergoeth in the room of another. When one giveth his own life for the saving of anothers. Such were those whom the Greeks called ἀντίψυχοι, who gave life for life, and body for body; who used to devote themselves to death to deliver others; as *Alceste* did for *Admetus*, *Philumene* for *Aristides*, *Antinous* for *Adrian*, the *Decii* for their Country. So Christ laid down his life to redeem ours, he bore the curse that we might escape it, he shed his blood in our lieu, and offered up himself a valuable compensation for our release.

2. *That it was paid and accepted in our lieu and stead.* There is no other ground with any consistency to Scripture or reason can be assigned of the payment of it; for not being paid for himself, it must meeds have been for us. It is

is chiefly and principally in reference to this, that he is our Mediator; it was God's law and justice which was against us, and the only way for a Mediator to deal with them, was in bearing the penalty to give justice the satisfaction which it did claime. So that should it be granted, that the word is sometimes used to signifie only an *interpreter* and *intermessenger*, yet the nature of the case betwixt God and us doth necessarily require, that whoever interposeth in way of mediation, must do it by price and ransome. And the Apostle puts it out of doubt, by asserting this as the cause, ground, and end of his mediatorship, in those places where he so stiles and mentions him, 1 *Tim.* 2. 5, 6. *There is one Mediator betwixt God and Man, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransome*, Heb. 9. 15, *He is the Mediator of the New Testament, that by means*

means of death, for the redemption of transgressions that were under the first Testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance, Heb. 12. 24. *And to Jesus the Mediator of the New Covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling.* In all which places the Apostle clearly assigns this as the cause and reason of Christ's being Mediator, namely, that he gave himself a ransome, and by his blood made reparation for transgression.

3. *This will further appear by observing that by vertue of the solution and payment which Christ hath made we are said to be redeemed*, Ephes. 1. 7. *repeated*, Col. 1. 14. *In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins*, &c. Though there be forgiveness, yet it is only through the redemption wrought and accomplished by the blood of Christ, *&c.* see *Rev.* 5. 9. *Heb.* 9.

12.

12. 1 Pet. 1. 18. 19. Rom. 3. 25. In all these places both our redemption is asserted, and the blood of Christ held forth as the meritorious and procuring cause of it. The words are ἀπολύτρωσις, and λύτρωσις, never so far as I remember, made use of in the whole New Testament, but to denote a proper redemption; save that ἀπολύτρωσις is once metaphorically employed, Heb. 11. 35. to signifie a temporal deliverance. From what hath been offered we may now confidently infer the truth and certainty of a satisfaction.

Object 1. Object. 1. *But it is Objected, That* Moses *as a type of Christ, in reference to his bringing the people of* Israel *out of* Egypt, *is called a redeemer, who yet paid no price for them, and consequently that the intendment of the Scripture, when it speaks of Christ's having redeemed us, is not that he payd any ransome for us, but only that he hath set us*

free

free, which he may have done by other ways and means than the ſolution of a price.

Anſw. To this I offer theſe Anſwers, (1.) It is a ſtrange way of arguing, that becauſe redemption is taken ſometimes Metaphorically, that therefore it muſt always be ſo taken; becauſe we ſo interpret it in ſuch places, where it is expreſly ſaid to be done in a way of power, muſt we likewiſe interpret it ſo in ſuch places where there is expreſs mention of a price and ranſome.

(2.) We have ſhown before, how that temporal deliverance out of *Egypt*, was not wrought without a typical reconciliation and price, to intimate that the ſpiritual deliverance was not to be effected but by a proportionable price and ranſome.

(3.) Though I do not deny but that *Moſes* was a type of Chriſt, and that the redemption

out of *Egypt* was a type of that which the Messiah was to work; yet it no ways follows, that because the redemption out of *Egypt* was without any ransome or price; therefore the redemption from sin must likewise be so; for it is not needful that the type and the thing typified be in all things alike, it is enough if they agree in that, wherein the one was designed of God to be the type of the other. *Jonas* his being in the belly of the Whale, was a type of Christ's being in the bowels of the Earth; must we therefore infer, that because *Jonas* was alive in the belly of the Whale, that Christ was so in the grave? So here, it was sufficient to render *Moses* a type of Christ, that they were both deliverers, and that they both wrought deliverances; but it was no wise needful either that their deliverances should be of one kind, or accomplished

after

after one manner. The deliverance which *Moses* wrought, was a temporal deliverance; who will therefore say that that of Christ was but a temporal deliverance? no more ought we to alledge, that because the one was accomplished without a price, that therefore the other must be effected so also.

(4.) *Moses* was not a type of Christ in all his Offices. Now that wherein *Moses* was a type of Christ was Christ's Kingship, and therefore we are not to expect an agreeableness betwixt what Christ wrought as he was Priest, and what *Moses* did; but we must seek the resemblance in that wherein the one was the type of the other. Now there is a resemblance betwixt *Moses*'s redeeming *Israel* from the tyranny of *Pharaoh*, and Christ's redeeming us from the power of Satan.

Object. 2. *But is is further objected, that redemption in this whole* Obj. 2.

affair muſt be underſtood in a Meta-
phorical ſenſe, becauſe we are ſaid
to be redeemed from iniquity, Tit. 2. 14. *and from a vain con-*
verſation, 1 Pet. 1. 18. *but it can-*
not be ſaid that there was a price
paid to ſin, or that there was a ſa-
tisfaction made to our vain converſation, and conſequently that to re-
deem is no more in this affair but to
deliver.

Anſw. For *anſwer*, (1.) The objectors at once proclaim themſelves ignorant both of Law and Religion; is there any thing more uſual, than when a perſon pays to the Creditor the debt of one that is in Priſon; or the ranſome of one that is in bondage, to him that detains him; to ſay that that perſon hath redeemed ſuch a one out of Priſon and from the Gally, though the ſatisfaction was not made to the Priſon or Gally, but to him or them by whom they were held and detained in theſe conditions. In all caſes

cases satisfaction is to be made to him who detains the captive by way of law, power, and authority; and not to them who detain him only in subserviency to the principal Creditor and Judge. Now it was God that we were debtors to, and criminals against; it was his Law we had broken, and it was by his Sentence that we stood condemned. Our sins were the debts satisfaction was to be made for, not to be made to: Satan was only an instrument of our vexation and bondage, in subserviency to God's leave and commission; neither they, nor he were properly our detainers, but only as the Jaylor and Irons detain a Malefactor at the Action of the Creditor, Sentence of the Judge, and Authority of the Law.

(2.) We have before distinguished the principal end of Christ's death from the subordinate, betwixt that which was the

primary end of his dying, and that which was only ſecondary. Now the principal and primary end of the death of Chriſt, was the ſatisfying the juſtice of God, the making him a compenſation for the diſhonour which had been done to his Name, and for the contempt which had been ſhown to his Law; the ſecondary, and that which was only conſequential on the former, was the purchaſing the ſpirit and grace for us, that thereby we might be enabled to reſiſt and conquer Satan, kill and ſubdue inbred corruption, have a conformity wrought in us to God's holineſs, and be brought again to a willing obedience.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

The ſatisfaction of Chriſt further juſtified from his having made reconciliation. The words uſed in this affair opened. Signifie God's being reconciled to us. Foretold that Chriſt ſhould make reconciliation. This the intendment of the Levitical Prieſthood. Chriſt properly a Prieſt. Hath offered a true ſacrifice. Through him we have attonement.

TO reconcile is to reſtore and recover loſt friendſhip, it is the renuing of peace betwixt perſons once at an agreement, but now at variance; ſo that it ſuppoſeth theſe two things.

1. *That there was once a peace and friendſhip betwixt God and Man.* God approved Man, and Man loved God. In the ſtate of innocency there was a twofold union betwixt Man and God; an union of *nature*, he was like God; and an union of *ſtate*, he was Gods friend.

2. *By the fall there arose a breach of that peace and friendship.* We at once lost the *image* of God, and forfeited his *favour*; we became alienated from God through sin, and God became alienated from us for sin. The enmity is mutual, not only on our part to God, *Col.* 1. 21. but on God's part to us. *There is no peace in him to the wicked*, Isa. 48. 22. *They are the children of his wrath*, Ephes. 2. 3. *And under his curse*, Gal. 3. 10. *Their persons are an abomination to him*, Psal. 5. 5. *And their services an abhorrency*, Prov. 15. 8 and 21. 4. Now Christ by a satisfactory sacrifice hath appeased the anger of God, purchased his grace to renue us, and so hath brought God and Man into a state of friendship and favour again.

The words the Holy Ghost expresseth this by, are καταλλάσσω *Rom.* 5. 10. 2 *Cor.* 5. 18, 19, 20. ἀπο

κατα-

καταλλάττω, *Ephes.* 2. 16. *Col.* 1. 20, 21. ἀποκατάλλαξις, *Col.* 1. 20. καταλλαγή, *Rom.* 5. 11. 2 *Cor.* 5. 18, 19. ἱλάσκομαι, *Heb.* 2. 17. ἱλασμὸς 1 *Joh.* 2. 2. 1 *Joh.* 4. 10. ἱλαστήριον, *Rom.* 3. 25. Now all these words signifie to appease, to render propitious, to turn away anger, to attone, to reconcile and import as well God's being reconciled to us, as our being reconciled to God. Καταλλάττεσθαι θεοῖς, in *Sophocles* is to attone the Anger of the Gods, and to render them propitious and favourable. Ἱλάσκεσθαι θεὸν in *Homer*, is by sacrifice to appease God. It is that which the Latines call *Propitiare & placare.* And in this sense do the Septuagint most frequently make use of them, *Exod.* 30. 15, 16. and 32. 30. *Levit.* 4. 20. and 10. 17. *Numb.* 28. 22, 30. In all which places, and innumerable more, the words signifie by appeasing anger, to reconcile God to us.

It is not denied but that the words are used sometimes to import and signifie our accepting the tenders of God's grace and favour, as 1 *Cor.* 5. 20. *We pray you in Christ's stead be ye reconciled.* But withal we affirm that in their most frequent use, they signifie the appeasing God's anger, and the reconciling him to us. This we confirm from the ensuing Scriptures, *Rom.* 5. 10. *when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son.* Where by being reconciled is principally meant, God's being reconciled to us, as appears,

(1.) Because the reconciliation spoken of here, is that to which justification is equivalent, *ver.* 9. but justification is God's reconciliation to us, not our conversion to him.

(2.) In that the reconciliation here intended, is that which is the immediate effect of the death of Christ,

Christ; and consequently we cannot understand by it the reconciling of our natures to God, this being immediat fruit of the spirit of Christ, (for though remotely it be founded on the death of Christ, yet in Scripture it is made the immediate effect of the resurrection, life, and power of Christ, *Acts* 5. 31. and latter part of this same *verse* 10. *Much more being reconciled by the death of his Son, we shall be saved by his life.*) But we must necessarily understand the reconciling of God to us.

(3.) Because the reconciliation here spoken of is that which is tendred to us, and which we receive, *ver.* 11. —— *have received the atonement*, and therefore cannot be meant of our reconciliation or conversion to God, forasmuch as we are not said to receive our conversion, or to have our conversion tendred to us, but must needs be spoken in reference to the

the appeasing of God's anger towards us, and our acceptation with him; and accordingly the Syriack renders it, *Reconciliatus est nobiscum Deus*, God was reconciled to us. Another Scripture which offers for the further establishing of this is, 2 *Cor.* 5. 18, 19, 20. *All things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given us the ministry of reconciliation, to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation, now then we are Embassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us, we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God.* Besides the reconciliation of man to God by conversion, mentioned in the latter end of the 20 *vers.* and to which we are there exhorted: There is also mention of God's reconciliation to us, and

that

hat this is the main thing insisted
n, and intended by the Apostle
ppears,

(1.) In that he expresseth it by God's not imputing our sins to us, not by our conversion from sin to God; and what is it now for God not to impute sin? it is, not to charge our sins upon us, so as to condemn us, but in consideration of the death of Christ to lay aside his anger, and receive us into favour.

(2.) Because the reconciliation here intended, is that, the declaration whereof is committed to the Ministers of the Gospel: Now that which they have in trust to Preach, is not that we are actually converted to God, but that God in consideration of the sufferings of Christ is willing, upon terms of faith and repentance, &c. to take us into favour and friendship.

(3.) Because, if the intendment of all these Verses, were only

our

our conversion to God, we should be necessitated to fasten nonsense upon the Apostle, for at this rate of expounding, the import would be, ye are *converted*, therefore be ye *converted*. Many more testimonies speaking clearly to the same purpose, if I studied not brevity, might be alledged: See *Ephes.* 2. 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17. *Col.* 1. 20.

Object. *But it may be objected, that we often read of our being reconciled to God; but we do not once read in the whole Bible that God is reconciled to us.*

Answ. It is true, but the reason is because God is the offended Ruler and Judge, and we are the offending Subjects; now in every case the party who *offends* is said to be reconciled to the party *offended*, and not on the contrary, so *Mat.* 5. 23, 24. 1 *Cor.* 7. 11. See that pertinent place to this purpose, 1 *Sam.* 29. 4. where the *Philistines* refusing

refuſing to let *David* march along with them to the encounter againſt *Saul*, aſſign this as the reaſon of it: *For wherewith ſhould he reconcile himſelf unto his Maſter? ſhould it not be with the heads of theſe men?* Now *David* had no enmity nor anger againſt *Saul*, only *Saul* was angry with *David*, and yet it is expreſſed that *David* ſhould reconcile himſelf to *Saul*, i. e. that he would endeavour by ſuch a ſtratagem to make *Saul* his friend. God having given us no cauſe then why we ſhould be angry with him, but we having given him cauſe of being provoked againſt us, it lyes with us to go and reconcile our ſelves to him, but how? by the appeaſing of his anger, which forasmuch as we could not do, Chriſt hath done it. That Chriſt by the appeaſing of God's wrath and anger hath wrought reconciliation, and by conſequence our very adverſaries being judges made

ſatiſ-

satisfaction, will receive full establishment, if we consider these things.

1. *That this was prophesied beforehand of the Messiah*, Dan. 9. 24. ——— *and to make reconciliation for iniquity.* Which the Apostle expressly applies to Christ, Heb. 2. 17. *Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people.* Ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας is by an enallage put for Ἱλάσκεσθαι περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, to make reconciliation with God for iniquities; not meerly, *Peccata auferre, aut purgare à peccato*; to take away sin, or to cleanse from sin; as *Grotius* in his notes, contrary to himself elsewhere, but *expiare, placare*, to attone, to reconcile by removing wrath according to the constant use of the word in all Greek

ἱλάσκεσθαι apud graecos scriptores omnes poetas, historicos, alios-que est placare. Grot. de satisf

Greek Authors. It is equivalent to that phraſe, *Heb.* 1. 3. — *when he had by himſelf purged our ſins.* Namely, by the attoning and pacifying God's anger, through the ſacrifice of himſelf, that we ſhould not be condemned for them; not by the ſanctification of believers from them. It is an obſervation of the reverend and learned Dr. *Owens*, that wherever *ſin*, not *ſinners*, are made the object of any mediatory acts of Chriſt, that act immediately reſpecteth God, and not the ſinner. So *Heb.* 9. 15. *For the redemption of tranſgreſſions*, i. e. to redeem from the wrath due to tranſgreſſion, by making God a reparation. And *Heb.* 9. 26. — *he appeared to put away ſin by the ſacrifice of himſelf*, to take it away by ſatisfaction, ſo that it ſhould not be charged.

2. *Chriſts reconciling us to God by propitiation and attonement, will receive further ſtrength and light,*

if

If we observe that this was the great truth and mystery which was signified and intended in the Aaronical Priesthood, and Levitical Sacrifices. That these did in their institution and end typifie the sacrifice of the Son of God, the Holy Ghost puts out of question by calling them *shadows*, Col. 2. 17. *Heb.* 8 5. *Heb.* 10, 1. *figures*, *Heb.* 9. 9. *patterns*, ibid. *ver.* 23. ὑπὸδειγμα, ἀντίτυπα, ὑποδείγματα. Now attonement and reconciliation is every where ascribed to these, *Levit.* 4. 20. and 5. 6. and 6. 7. and 10. 11. *Num.* 5. 8. and 28. 22. and 31. 50. *& alibi.* And that not only in reference to some sins, or to lesser sins, but in reference to all sins, to the very greatest, *Levit.* 16. 21, 22. *Levit.* 5. 1, 2, 3. 4, 5, 6, 7, 14. &c. *Num.* 5. 6.

Object. *If it should be objected that there were some sins from which by the law of* Moses *they could not be justified*, Acts 13. 39. *and therefore that their sacrifices*

di

did not ſerve to make attonement for all ſins.

I Anſwer, (1.) All that the Apoſtle intends is, that the ſacrifices of the law could expiate no ſin further than typically, and that it was Chriſt whom they typified who could alone abſolutely juſtifie from any ſin. The ſacrifices of the law could not of themſelves ſo much as *attone* for one ſin, Gal. 3. 13. but typically they ſerved to make attonement for every ſin: The Jews in reference to whom the Apoſtle diſcourſeth, truſted ſolely to ſacrifices for righteouſneſs and life, and in this he affirms that they were miſtaken, and that it was only the blood and ſacrifice of Chriſt which they ſignified and ſhadowed, that could really free the conſcience from the guilt of the leaſt ſin.

(2.) It may be Anſwered, that under the law there was a twofold guilt, a Ceremonial, and a Moral;

one external binding over the transgressour unto temporal punishment, another spiritual binding over the offendor unto eternal wrath. Now sacrifices as they were incorporated into their *policy* as well as a part of their worship were in many cases appointed, and accordingly served to deliver from temporal guilt, *Heb.* 9. 15. but there were other cases wherein they were not at all allowed to deliver from the temporal punishment, *Psal.* 51. 16. but according to their *political* constitutions death was without mercy to be inflicted on the offendor. Now says the Apostle, these sins from the temporal guilt of which all your sacrifies could not discharge you, the blood of Christ is sufficient to acquite you from the eternal guilt even of those.

This objection being discharged, it stands established that atonement and reconciliation

ascrib

aſcribed to ſacrifices, and that not only in reference to ſome ſins, but to every ſin. Now this expiation was not real, but only typical; all their ſacrifices were not able to acquit them from the *moral* guilt of one ſin, *Heb.* 9. 9. and 7. 19. and 10. 4. *For it is not poſſible that the blood of Bulls and Goats ſhould take away ſins.* But the ſole intendment of all their ſacrifices was to ſhaddow forth the great ſacrifice of the Meſſiah, and the atonement and expiation which were to be made by it. This will arrive with more light to the Reader, if we preſent it in theſe three heads.

1. *Chriſt is our true Prieſt in matters pertaining to God, whom all the other Prieſts did but ſhaddow.* All others were only called Prieſts becauſe they repreſented him, and outwardly by type expreſſed, what he was really to accompliſh and do: and never one could do the

proper work of a Prieſt, namely, make reconciliation for the ſins of the people, but he. That he ſhould be a Prieſt then only in a metaphorical ſenſe, is ſuch a contradiction to Law and Goſpel, as it could not poſſibly receive the entertainment of any, who had not firſt ſet themſelves in oppoſition to the whole myſtery of God; but that Chriſt was properly a Prieſt, may be many ways rendred evident.

(1.) From the definition of a Prieſt properly ſo called, *Heb.* 5. 1. ***Every high Prieſt taken from among men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and ſacrifices for ſins.*** That this is the definition of a Prieſt properly ſo called, is both clear in the thing it ſelf, for if ſuch a one as is here deſcribed be not properly a Prieſt, there was never a Prieſt properly ſo called in the world; as alſo in the Apoſtles accommodating it, *ver.* 4. to *Aaron*

wh

who was unqueſtionably a Prieſt in a proper, and not in metaphorical ſenſe. Now that Jeſus Chriſt is ſuch a Prieſt as is here deſcribed, is manifeſt in that all the parts of this deſcription do admirably appertain to him; he was taken from among men. To this very end principally, and none other, did he partake of the humane nature, *Heb.* 10. 5. He was alſo ordained for men, ſee *ver.* 5, 6, and herein he excelled all other Prieſts that he was conſtituted only for others, and not for himſelf, *Heb.* 7. 27. Laſtly, he was ordained to offer gifts and ſacrifices, yea herein he tranſcended all other Prieſts, that he had ſomething of his own to offer; other Prieſts had indeed ſomething to offer, but nothing of their own; they only offered the bodies of beaſts, which the people brought them, but Chriſt had a body given him to be at his own diſpoſal to this purpoſe. That

this deſcription of a Prieſt belongs properly to Chriſt, yea, that it is he whom the Holy Ghoſt principally deſcribes, may be put out of queſtion, by obſerving that the Apoſtle applies it *ver.* 5. particularly to him.

(2.) That Chriſt was properly a Prieſt, may be further eſtabliſhed from *Heb.* 8. 3. ***Every high Prieſt is ordained to offer gifts and ſacrifices: wherefore it is of neceſſity that this man have ſomewhat alſo to offer.*** Now if Chriſt be not truly a Prieſt, this way of arguing is altogether impertinent; for it might be eaſily replyed, that though it be needful that a Prieſt properly ſo called, ſhould have ſomewhat to offer, yet it is not neceſſary that he who is only metaphorically a Prieſt, ſhould have any thing to to offer; for it is no ways needful, that whatever appertains to that which is true and real, ſhould alſo appertain to that

which

which is figurative and improper. Though a man be a rational creature, yet it doth not follow that the picture of a man ſhould be ſo. And therefore the Apoſtle by concluding that Chriſt behoved to have ſomewhat to offer, becauſe he was a Prieſt, mvſt needs intend that he was a Prieſt in a proper, and not in a metaphorical ſenſe.

(3.) It appears further, that Chriſt was truly and properly a Prieſt, in that he was a Prieſt of a true and proper order, namely, of the order of *Melchiſedeck*, Pſal. 110. 4. *Heb.* 5. 10. and 7. 17. 21. I do not now diſpute who *Melchiſedeck* was, all that I affirm is, that according to the Holy Ghoſt he was a real Prieſt, and that his order was a real order, and therefore Chriſt being of a true order, behoved alſo to be a true Prieſt. As the Levitical Prieſts were truely and properly Prieſts, be-

cauſe of the order of *Aaron*, which was a true and proper order of Prieſthood; ſo Chriſt being of the order of *Melchiſedech*, which was a true order of Prieſthood, muſt alſo have been a true Prieſt. And this is the reaſon why believers though all Prieſts, *Rev.* 1. 5. yet are allotted to no order, becauſe they are not properly Prieſts, but only metaphorically ſo.

(4.) That Chriſt was properly a Prieſt, may be demonſtrated from the deſign of the Apoſtle throughout the *Hebrews*, eſpecially from the 7. *chap.* to the 10. which is to exalt the Prieſthood of Chriſt above that of *Aaron*. Now this were the moſt incongruous way of diſputing imaginable, if Chriſt were only metaphorically a Prieſt, *Aaron* having been properly one; for however Chriſt might be more eminent than *Aaron* in other reſpects, yet

in reſpect of his Prieſthood he would be leſs excellent, foraſmuch as what is *ſo* only metaphorically, is beyond all contradiction leſs than what is properly *ſo*.

(5.) This may be yet confirmed from the more ſolemn inſtitution and confirmation of Chriſt's Prieſthood, above that of any other; for the more ſolemn and ſacred the inſtitution of a thing is, the more excellent is the thing it ſelf. Now Chriſt was eſtabliſhed a Prieſt by oath, which none other ever was, *Heb.* 7. 20, 21. and therefore his Prieſthood is more excellent than the Prieſthood of any elſe, and conſequently muſt be a true Prieſthood, and not a metaphorical.

(6.) Chriſt was properly a King & Propher, and conſequently properly a Prieſt, foraſmuch as the Scripture declares him to be a Prieſt, as well as any of the former, and he was typified in that, as well as in theſe. 2. *He*

2. *He is the true ſacrifice*; bei... *Now* ... a true Prieſt he muſt have a tr... *ath* ... ſacrifice, *Heb.* 8. 3. yea, all oth... *be ſa* ... ſacrifices were but meerly typic... o. — ... of the ſacrifice which he was ... *ering* ... offer. *No other ſacrifice coul...* ... *make the comers thereunto perfect...* *ſs fig* ... *or take away ſins*, Heb. 10. 1, ... *he Sou* ... *They were only appointed to be ... no* ... *ſhadow of the great ſacrifice ... in* ... *Chriſt*, Heb. 8. 5. *Heb.* 10. 1. H... *id on* ... alone in the offering of himſel... *xpoun* ... offered to God a true ſacrifi... *to he...* That the death of Chriſt is a ſ... *od fo* ... crifice, the following Scriptur... at C ... may be ſufficient to render clea... rieſt ... *Epheſ.* 5. 2. *He hath given him...* ll the ... *ſelf for us, an offering and a ſacr...* er; ... *fice to God for a ſweet ſmelling ſa...* y the ... *vour*, 1 Cor. 5. 9. *Chriſt our Paſſ...* eath, ... *over is ſacrificed for us*, Heb. ... rifice ... 14. — *through the eternal ſpirit ... as ob* ... *offered up himſelf to God*, Heb. ... *e holy* ... 27. *He needeth not daily to offer ... as pur* ... *ſacrifices, for this he did once wh... e righ* ... *he offered up himſelf*; Heb. 9. 2... eb. 1...

N...

Now once in the end of the world, he hath appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself, Heb. 10. 10. — *we are sanctified by the offering of the body of Jesus once for all. It is one of the most groundless figments of the world, which the Socinians here suggest, namely, that none of all this is to be interpreted in reference to any thing Christ did on earth, but that it is only to be expounded in reference to his entring into heaven, and his appearing before God for us.* We do not deny but that Christ continues to be a priest in heaven, and shall do so, till the whole mediatory work be over; but withal we affirm, that by the shedding of his blood and death, he perfected his whole sacrifice here on earth. *Redemption was obtained before he entred into the holy places*, Heb. 9. 22. *Sin was purged before he sat down on the right hand of majesty on high*, Heb. 1. 3. where by *purging* is

not

not meant purging by ſanctifyin
grace,

(1.) Becauſe that ſpoken
here was perfected ere Chri
went to heaven, which ſanctifi
tion is not.

(2.) Becauſe the purging he
ſpoken of is that which is do
by Chriſt alone, without the
and intervention of any oth
means ——— *when he had by hi
ſelf purged our ſins*, but ſanctifi
tion is accompliſhed by the wo
and ſpirit; ſo that the purging
ſin here, is the expiating of ſi
which is expreſly aſſerted to ha
been finiſhed are Chriſt aſcende
That Chriſt's Prieſthood was
earth, is further demonſtrated b
all thoſe places where he is ſaid
have offered himſelf *once*, an
where there is mention made
one offering, *Heb.* 7. 27. and
28. and 10. 10, 14. for this ca
not refer to what he does in he
ven, ſeeing what he does there,

doe

pes *always*, and is continually in
oing of it, it muſt neceſſarily
fer therefore to what he did on
rth. That his Prieſthood was
n earth, may be further confirm-
d, by conſidering the parts of
e Levitical Prieſthood; there
as in that, beſides the high
rieſt's carrying the blood into
e Holy of Holies, and ſprink-
ng the Mercy Seat with it, the
aying of the beaſt without: Now
s Chriſt's interceſſion in heaven,
by which he continues his Prieſt-
ood) anſwers the laſt of theſe.
o there behoved to be Chriſt's
ffering of himſelf a ſacrifice on
arth, to anſwer the firſt; other-
ways there ſhould not have been
correſpondency in the heavenly
hings to the earthly. Laſtly,
Chriſt his being Prieſt on earth,
will be yet ſtrengthened, by ob-
ſerving that there were many ſa-
crifices, the blood whereof was
not at all carried into the Holy
place

place (for that was done but once a year, *Heb.* 9. 7.) and that these sacrifices were types of Christ; and therefore what Christ was mainly to do, behoved to be before he entred into heaven, otherwise the Antitype had not answered the type, and that in the very thing whereinit was a type. So that we see Christ is both true Priest, and true sacrifice, wich the Socinians themselves being judges eſtabliſheth the ſatisfaction of Chriſt.

3 *It is by Chriſt alone, that we have the true and real attonement.* All the Levitical propitiations and reconciliations were at most but typical of this. He alone hath purged away our ſins, *Heb.* 1. 3. i. e. *He hath removed the guilt of all ſins from the conſcience and the obnoxiouſneſs of the ſinner to puniſhment for them*, Heb. 9. 14. *for as the ſanctifying of the fleſh*, ver. 13. was the ſetting the offen-

offendor free from temporal puniſhment, *ſo the purging the conſcience* is the ſetting the offendor free from eternal puniſhment. *He hath made reconciliation for ſins*, Heb. 2. 17. *Through him we have atonement*, Rom. 5. 11. *He hath ſlain the enmity which was in God to ſinners, by his croſs*, Epheſ. 2. 16. *He is our* ἱλασμὸς, *propitiation*, 1 Joh. 2. 2. and 1 *Joh.* 4. 10. Our *placamen*, that by which God is reconciled towards us. *He is our* ἱλαστήριον, *Rom.* 3. 25. It is much at one whether you take it in the Maſculine, or in the Neuter; if you take it in the firſt, then the import is, that it is Chriſt who reconciles God to us; if you take it in the ſecond, then the meaning is, that he doth it by himſelf as by a *placamen*, an anger appeaſing ſacrifice. Muſt take it in the Neuter, and ſo it is either by way of alluſion to the propitiatory ſacrifices, by which

God

God was ſaid to be attoned and reconciled, *Levit.* 6. 30. and 8. 15. Hence the Ram was called the Ram of attonement, *Num.* 5. 8. Κριὸς ἱλασμοῦ, Septuagint. *So Chriſt hath put away ſin by the ſacrifice of himſelf*, Heb. 9. 26. Or elſe by way of alluſion to the Mercy Seat (which the Apoſtle calls ἱλαστήριον, *Heb.* 9. 5.) either becauſe the Mercy Seat covered the Ark; the law which charg-eth and condemneth us for ſin lay in the Ark, *Exod.* 25. 16. Now the Mercy Seat covered the Ark, to ſignifie that through Chriſt the law ſhould not condemn us, *Exod.* 25. 20, 21. *Exod.* 36. 34. *So Chriſt hath blotted out, removed, and cancelled the handwriting which was againſt us*, Col. 2. 14. Or elſe becauſe through ſprinkling of the blood of the ſacrifice upon the Mercy Seat, God ſignified himſelf pleaſed and attoned, *Levit.* 16. 15, 16, 17. and it is very remarkable

hat the High Priest durst not go ear the Mercy Seat, but with the lood of the sacrifice which was ppointed to make attonement. o in and through the blood of Christ we are accepted, *Ephes.* 1. 6. but without coming in the ver- ue, and under the sprinkling of he blood of Christ there is no cceptance. Or else, because it was om the mercy seat, that God as conciled communed with his ople, *Exod* 25. 22. *Num.* 7. 89. o in and through Jesus Christ we ave access with boldness and con- dence, *Ephes.* 2. 18. and 3. 12. We hope now that from this hich hath been tendred in the esent chapter, especially, toge- er with what hath been deliver- d in the preceding chapters, we ay boldly infer and assert the uth of Christ's satisfaction.

Object. 1. *But it is objected, that od before hand loved us, forasmuch as in demonstration of his*

O *love,*

love, he ſent his Son to dye for us and conſequently that he cannot be ſaid to have been angry with us, or that he needed to be reconciled.

For *Anſwer* 1. It is true, God's love was carried towards us as his creatures, but at the ſame time he hated us as ſinners. *Deus eodem modo quando nos oderat, diligebat, odit in unoquoque noſtrum quod fecerat, amavit quod fecerat*, Bec. He did not love us and hate us at the ſame time, and in the ſame reſpect. He loved us as his creatures whom he intended to recover, he hated us as rebels who had transgreſſed his law, and contemned his government.

Anſwer 2. There is a twofold love in God, a love of benevolence, and a love of friendſhip; a love of good will, and a love of delight. The firſt we aſcribe to God antecedently to the conſideration of the death of Chriſt as that which was the ſpring and

untain of his giving Christ; and
is we own to have been superla-
ve in its kind, *Joh.* 3. 16. 1 *Joh.*
. 10. Neither was there in God
y hatred or anger opposite to
is love; but then this love was
thing else but a purpose of con-
iving, and by such means of
inging about our reconciliation,
hile in the mean time we were
e objects of his wrath, *Joh.* 3.
6, *Ephes.* 2. 3. God's eternal
urpose of reconciling himself to
s, did not in the mean time ex-
mpt us from being the objects of
is wrath, but supposeth both that
e were, and behoved to continue
o, till by such ways and mediums
ur peace was purchased. It im-
lyes not the least contrariety to
firm that God hated us, but yet
as to purpose by such means his
turning into friendship with us.
the 42. chap. of *Job* ver. 7, 8.
Ve read of God's being angry
ith *Jobs* three friends, yet so as

to signifie by what means he would again accept them.

Object. 2. *It is objected 2ly, That upon supposition that God would not pardon us without a satisfaction, and that Christ undertook and hath made satisfaction, we should be more obliged to the Son, than to the Father.*

Answ. We are infinitely, and alike obliged to both; to the Father in giving his Son to make the satisfaction, and in taking us into favour upon it, being made; to the Son in condescending and undertaking to make it. And accordingly the Scripture mentions equally the love of both, the love of the Father as the rise and spring of our reconciliation, *Joh.* 3. 16. 1 *Joh.* 4. 10. *Rom.* 5. 8. and in reference to this he is called our Saviour, 1 *Tim.* 1. 1. *Tit.* 1. 3. The love of the Son, as the means of carrying it on, and accomplishing it, *Eph.* 5. 2. 25. *Rev.* 1. 5. *Gal.*

so. *Eph.* 3. 19. So that to make the comparison betwixt the one and the other, argues not only bold presumption, but also ignorance of this whole mystery of God.

Object. 3. *But it is alledged thirdly, that by asserting the satisfaction of Christ, we must be exposed to one of these two absurdities; either that Christ hath satisfied himself, or else that he is more merciful than the Father, and pardons sin without any satisfaction.*

Answer 1. To this I return these two things. 1. It is no ways absurd, to say he hath satisfied himself. The Court of Aldermen having a Citizen before them, who is obnoxious to a mulct, and which they in consistency with the preservation of Government cannot remit, and the offender not having wherewithal to pay, may not one of themselves make solution in the offenders behalf to the Court; and so by making satisfa-

ction to the Bench, he makes also satisfaction to himself, forasmuch as he is a member of it. So God being in this whole affair considerable a Governour, and not as a meer Creditor, it is no pageantry to affirm that he might satisfie himself.

Answer 2. Upon supposition that Christ hath made satisfaction, yet it doth not follow that *adequate* he hath made it to himself, seeing he made it as God man, and it was made to him only as God. Now as there is nothing more usual in Scripture than to affirm contrary things of Christ under different respects; for example, *that the Father is greater than he*, Joh. 14. 28. *and yet that the Father and he are one*, Joh. 10. 30. *that he is Gods equal*, Phil. 2 6. *and yet Gods servant*, ibid. *ver.* 7. So under different respects he both made the satisfaction, and had it made to him. Having at great length demon-

monſtrated the ſatisfaction of Chriſt, which is the alone plea upon which we can be juſtified, the next enquiry is how upon this plea, we come to be juſtified.

CHAP. IX.

How upon the Plea of a ſatisfaction made by Chriſt, we are juſtified. The ſatisfaction of Chriſt effectual before made, as well as after. None actually juſtified till they believe what juſtification is.

HAving fully eſtabliſhed the ſatisfaction of Chriſt, which is the only plea a guilty ſinner hath why he ſhould be juſtified, that which falls next under conſideration is how upon this Plea we come to be juſtified, or how we come to have an intereſt in the ſatisfaction made by Chriſt, ſo as by vertue of that *Plea* to be acquit-

ted, I had intended and accordingly digeſted my thoughts to a conſiderable length on this ſubject, and treated the whole intereſt both of faith and works in this affair; but finding this treatiſe already lengthened beyond what the Reader may deſire, though much ſhort of what the ſubject requires; and not knowing to what bigneſs the *Appendix* may grow, I ſhall not proceed as I had deſigned, but refer it to another ſeaſon, if not wave it forever. Only that the preſent tract may not be wholly imperfect, it will be neceſſary to ſuggeſt a few things.

This then I would firſt premiſe, that the ſatisfaction of Chriſt was as effectual to juſtification and life to thoſe who could plead it, before it was actually made (he having undertaken it) as it is to thoſe who can now plead it, it is made: the Father acted in the ſame way of juſtifying believers then that he

doth

doth now. The blood of Christ had the same efficacy then which it hath now, *Rom.* 3. 25. *whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past.* The Old Testament Saints were saved upon terms of justice, as well as the New. God by exacting afterwards full satisfaction from Christ, declares himself to have acted towards them as a righteous Judge, as well as a gracious Father. This I take to be the intendment of the Apostle, *Col.* 1. 2. *And having made peace through the blood of his Cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself, by him I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven.* Whereby things in heaven is meant the Saints already in heaven, who are said now to be reconciled, because the price of their reconciliation was now paid. All that were saved then, were saved

See Gomar, on the place.

saved alone through *faith* in Christ, *Heb.* 11. 13. In this federal transaction betwixt the Father and Son, about the recovery and pardon of sinners, Divines take notice that there is a mutual trusting of each other; as Christ having paid the price and ransome, takes the Fathers word now, for the bringing in and justifying of all those in due time, in whose room and stead it was paid; so the Father before received many into favour and to glory, upon the Sons promise, that in the appointed time he would make *him* a full satisfaction.

Having premised this, there is a twofold justification, one fundamental in Christ of all the elect before faith, yet so as they abode under wrath till they came actually to believe; wherein that consists I had at length drawn out, but must now forbear it.

2*ly*. There is an actual justification

cation of all the elect in Christ upon their believing. The Father and Son having contrived and brought about this great affair of our recovery without any rise or help from us, we can have no actual interest in the benefits of it, but upon such termes as the Father and Son have agreed unto. And here I would observe these two things. 1. The necessity that we should not be justified, but upon some condition. 2. That it was most agreeable to the Divine wisdome that faith should be the condition.

1. It was not fit that we should be actually justified, but upon some condition; and this is the main hinge upon which the compact betwixt the Father and Son in his undertaking the work of redemption, turns, *Isa.* 53. 11. *By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justifie many*, i. e. by the knowledge of him, where knowledge

ledge (as often elsewhere in Scripture) signifies faith. It was not fit that the justice of God should acquit us to the impeachment of the Divine purity. The holiness of God was a bar to our being received into favour, as well as his righteousness; it was needful therefore that a respect should be born to that as well as this, and that though justice had received a satisfaction, yet that the benefits of it should not redound to us, but upon terms of conformity to the purity and holiness of God.

2. So far as can be imagined by us, it was most convenient that faith should be the condition. (1.) Because that alone quites all pretensions of being justified any other way, and trusts solely to be justified this way. It is the nature of faith to take us of from whatever else we are apt to confide in, and to engage us only to depend upon the righteousness of Christ.

It

It is the conſtitution of faith, and no other grace to truſt the promiſe of God, and to receive and embrace what is there tendred. Hence faith is ſet in oppoſition to ſelf, truſt, and confidence, *Phil.* 3. 9. *Rom.* 9. 31, 32. *Rom.* 4. 15. *Gal.* 5. 4, 5. It is faith alone bywhich the ſoul owns Chriſt for its ſurety, rolls over it ſelf upon him, ſo that in *conſpectu fore* iu the account of the law, Chriſt and the pleader are but one. (2.) Becauſe it is by faith that Chriſt and we come to be ſpiritually united, and as it were concorporated together. Chriſt is brought to dwell in us by faith, *Eph.* 3. 17. and we are implanted and rooted in him by the ſame, *Col.* 2. 7. by faith Chriſt and we become one ſpirit, 1 *Cor.* 6. 17. This being then the bond of union betwixt him and us, it was moſt convenient that it ſhould be the condition of our intereſt in him, and of our right to all the bene-

fits

fits of his ſatisfaction and purchaſe. What this faith is, how it is called our righteouſneſs, and how none are actually juſtified till they believe, though prepared to have been here inſerted, yet to prevent the exceſs of this diſcourſe, ſhall be wholly ſuperceded.

Only a little how upon our believing we are actually juſtified. Juſtification is God's act, *Rom.* 8.33. A man is then juſtified, when he is conſtituted righteous in law; now this is done by *God's imputing and accounting the righteouſneſs of Chriſt ours*, Rom. 4, 11. 24. *Rom.* 5.19 *So that he is made our righteouſneſs*, 1 *Cor.* 1. 30. *Jer.* 23. 6. and we are as righteous through him as God can require or doth deſire, *Phil.* 3. 9. It is no more harſh that his righteouſneſs ſhould be thus made ours, then that our ſins ſhould be made his, which the Apoſtle expreſly aſſerts, 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. and we have

before

before opened. Now God may be ſaid to juſtifie ſuch a perſon two ways.

(1.) In his ſecret acquitting of him within himſelf, accounting of him as righteous, and in a ſtate of favour. He that was in a ſtate of hatred before, the obligation to puniſhment being now diſſolved, is accounted of as in a ſtate of friendſhip.

(2.) In the conſtituting and proclaiming in the Goſpel, that whoever believes is juſtified. As a perſon is condemned by a law, and ſaid to be condemned when the law condemns him: ſo we are juſtified by the Goſpel patent, and may be ſaid to be ſo, when that Charter declares us juſtified, which it doth if we believe. Now the effects of this are a non-imputation of ſin, and a donation of a right to life; our obligation to puniſhment is diſſolved, and we are veſted with a title to life.

1. Sin

1. Sin ſhall never be charged upon us in the legal guilt of it, *Rom.* 8. 1, 33, 34. The legal guilt of all ſins paſt is removed formally, and the legal guilt of all ſins to come is removed virtually: That is thus, juſtification takes off legal guilt where once it was, and keeps it of where elſe it would be.

And (1.) It is no more harſh that ſins ſhould be legally diſimputed to us before committed, than that they ſhould be legally imputed to Chriſt before committed, which all the ſins of the elect, who have lived, and are yet to live, ſince the death of Chriſt, were.

(2.) Becauſe the guilt of ſin may be as well diſimputed to believers before committed by them, as the ſatisfaction of Chriſt was imputed to believers before made by him, which it was to all the Old Teſtament Saints.

2. Being conſtituted righteous, by

by having the righteousness of Christ accounted ours, not only our obligation to punishment is dissolved, but there also emergeth and ariseth a new title to life, Christ purchased not only redemption from wrath, but a right to the heavenly inheritance. And this shall suffice at least at present to have been discoursed upon this whole affair.

AN APPENDIX.

In vindication of the Satisfaction of Christ, from the frivolous Objections of a late *Socinian* Pamphlet made against a Sermon of mine preached at the Morning Lecture.

SECT. I.

The Title examined. The Scripture prefixed, proved destructive of the which they were brought to establish.

IT is not needful to give a further account of the inducements and grounds of Preaching upon that subject, [illegible]

what the Preface to the foregoing discourse intimates. The cost of that exercise was before hand considered, and whatever may be the consequences of it, I hope to have satisfaction and peace in the bearing and encountring of them.

The party who hath appeared in opposition to the doctrine then held forth, hath (from what motives himself best knows) been pleased to conceal his name, and therefore (seeing it may be omitted without prejudice to the cause I manage) I shall not concern my self about him, though I could particularly declare him and assign his character: Only it had been but ingenuous, when he had published the name of another, and in that exposed him to the law, to have given a more particular account of himself than what can meerly be gathered from two *numerical* letters; wherein he hath either endeavoured, or may be able

to wrong me, I pardon him; but what he hath attempted in oppoſition to the truth, cannot in conſiſtency to conſcience and duty be overlookt.

The Title of his Book is very ſpecious, for what can more invite a Reader, than the *Freeneſs of God's grace in the forgiveneſs of ſins by Jeſus Chriſt.* But all is not gold which gliſters; a Box of poiſon may have a fair inſcription; the Prince of Darkneſs transforms himſelf into; and deſires to paſs for, an Angel of Light. Error loves to appear in the garb of truth. I need not to tell whoſe character that is, *deceiving and being deceived*, 2 Tim. 3. 13. But we ſhall endeavour to unmaſk them here, by animadverting theſe three things.

1. *That it is the great endeavour of theſe men to preſent us as enemies to the grace of God.* Whereas (1.) There is nothing we deſire more

more to exalt and admire, and whatever doctrine of ours, either directly or indirectly reflects upon the Freeneſs of God's Grace we diſclaime and renounce it: but we boldly affirme the Grace of God to be as free in the forgiveneſs of ſin upon a ſatisfaction, as it would have been, if it had been poſſible to have forgiven ſin without a ſatisfaction; and how it is ſo, you may ſee opened at large from page 23. to page 30. of the preceeding diſcourſe. (2.) We aſſert our adverſaries to be in this particular the only men who are tardy, in that they eſtabliſh juſtification by works, which the Apoſtle every where excludes as oppoſite to, and in this buſineſs utterly deſtructive of grace, *Eph.* 2. 8, 9 *Rom.* 11. 6.

2. *We would have obſerved that it is the method of theſe Gentlemen, to cry up the grace of God, to the overthrow of his holineſs and righteouſneſs.* We acknowledge God to

be infinitely gracious, but withal we affirme to be infinitely pure and just. We dare not exalt one perfection of God, to the diminution of another. We know God cannot be gracious, if at the same time he may not be righteous also. God can as soon cease to be God, as that one property of his nature should be exalted to the dishonour of the rest. Having therefore in the foregoing discourse from page 38. to 51. demonstrated the inconsistency of forgiveness, without a satisfaction, with the truth, justice, and holiness of God, it necessarily follows, that there can be no such grace in God. He cannot be kind to us so as to be cruel to himself.

3. *We take notice, that according to the Socinian Divinity, they might have as well filled their Book the Freeness of God's Grace in the forgiveness of sins by* Paul, *or some other of the Apostles, as by Christ.*

For

for that which they assign as the ground of God's forgiving sins by Christ, being only that he preached the doctrine of forgiveness, and afterwards sealed the truth of it with his blood, accords to *Paul*, and other of the Apostles, as well as to Christ; for they Preached the same doctrine, and that by immediate revelation, and also confirmed the truth of it by martyrdome and death; so that according to the opinion of these Gentlemen, I see no cause but that they might have given their Book the title I alledge, as well as that which they have given it.

The next thing which comes under consideration, is the examination of the Scriptures which he prefixes. And he could have quoted few in the whole Bible, which are more destructive of his cause; and herein God displays his wisdom, that that whereof his adversaries hope most to serve their design, proves

utterly subversive of it. The first is *Rom.* 3. 24. *Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ.* Now the opening of this Verse, together with the two following, will without any more ado sufficiently evidence, how disserviceable it is to the design it was brought for. We have in these three verses justification set forth in all its parts and causes. First, the efficient impulsive cause of it in God, *Causa impulsiva nostræ, justified freely by his grace,* δικαιούμενοι δωρεὰν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι. Justification is free in respect of the love that gave Christ to merit it, *Heb.* 2. 9. *Given by the grace of God to taste death for every man.* The alone moving and impulsive cause of God's bestowing Christ, was his eternal good pleasure and love. It is free also in respect of any works performed by us to deserve justification, *Tit.* 3. 5. *Not by works of the law which we have*

have done, but according to his mer-
cy he hath saved us. Nothing re-
quired or done on our part to me-
rit it, and this and no more is in-
timated *by grace and freely*; for
that the excluding the merit and
satisfaction of Christ is not here
intended, the opening of the
next words will confirm and de-
monstrate. 2*ly*. There then is the
material and meritorious means
procuring justification, *Causa im-*
pulsiva προκαταρκτικὴ: and this is the
blood of Christ, *through the re-*
demption that is in Jesus, and in his
blood. Though justification be
free in respect of us, yet it is me-
rited in respect of him. The
import of redemption we have
formerly opened, and proved it
to be a deliverance by solution
and payment of a ransome. See
from pag. 146. to 161. though
there be nothing done by us to
merit justification, yet we have it
only by the intervention of

Christ

Christ as the deserving cause; this the Apostle amplifies from God's exhibiting of him to this purpose, *whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation.* What the intendment of ἱλαστήριον is, is before opened, God set him forth to be a means of atoneing him, and appeasing his anger, that by him, as a meritorious cause, we might be set free from the wrath to which we stood obnoxious: To this end God constituted and appointed him Mediator, proposed him in the types and shadows of the law, actually exhibited him in the flesh, and offereth him to the world, as he through whom, as a *placamen*, God's wrath is appeased, and his favour recovered. 3*ly*. We have the final cause, First, the *finis cujus*, the end on the part of God — *to declare his righteousness*, πρὸς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ, to shew his righteousness, *justus agnoscatur*: By righteous-

ness

ness here, we can by no means understand God's benignity, kindness, and mercy; not that we deny, but that it may admit that signification in some other places, where the subject matter necessitates to it: but here it clearly signifies that property in God, by which he is enclined to punish sin; and this is the proper and usual import of it in the Scripture, *Rom.* 2. 5. 2 *Thes.* 1. 6. *Rev.* 16. 5, 6. And it is from this principle of his nature carrying him against sin, that he is compared to fire, *Deut.* 4. 24. *Isa.* 33. 14. *Heb.* 12. 29. and in respect of this, wrath and anger are often ascribed to him, *Rom.* 9. 22. *Exod.* 32. 10. *Psal.* 6. 1, *Rom.* 1. 18. That this is the intendment of *righteousness* here, is evident from hence, that Christ in the shedding of his blood is set out to be a *propitiation*, which fully argues both that God was angry, and

that

that by Christ, as a propitiatory
sacrifice, his vindictive and angry
is appeased. Then we have the
finis cui, the end with respect to
us, —*that he might be the justifier*.
The design God had in all this,
namely his giving Christ in the
way of death and blood to be a
propitiation, was the taking a
company of poor creatures, who
lay obnoxious to his indignation,
into his grace and favour again.
4*ly*. We have the instrument or
cause, or the means by which we
come to be interested in Christ,
and to have the redemption and
justification purchased by him ap-
plyed to us, and that is *through*
faith in his blood. By this time I
hope the Reader perceives, not
only how impertinent, but how
destructive this Text proves to
the Pamphleters design, and how
he falls by his own weapon.

The second Text which the Gen-
tleman hath been pleased to press,
is

Col. 1. 14. *in whom we have re-*
demption through his blood, even the
forgiveneſs of ſins. And this is
together as unanſwerable to the
nd it was brought for as the for-
mer: For do but obſerve, here
ur ſalvation is expreſly aſſerted
o be by way of redemption, and
e price of this redemption to
e the blood of Chriſt, which is
plain termes to affirm that we
re ſaved by the intervention of a
uſfaction for to be in a proper
enſe redeemed; and redemption
hrough blood, is to be ſet free
hrough the ſufferings of Chriſt
s a valuable compenſation for
ur releaſe. But here is the
of the Socinian party,
nd that which hath impoſed up-
n the Pamphleter in his anſwer
ns, that becauſe there is mention
forgiveneſs, therefore all ſa-
isfaction muſt be excluded, but
he falſity of this is already de-
monſtrated, and to ſuppoſe an op-

poſition,

position, where there is so perfect a harmony, is to profess utter unacquaintance with the Gospel. It is forgiveness in that it is not merited by us, but doth this any way hinder, but that it may be purchased by Christ. We know no inconsistence betwixt these two, that it should be of pure grace in reference to us, and yet of justice in reference to Christ.

The third and last Scripture mustered up by the Author in his Title Page, a Prov. 12. 15. *He that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the just, even they both are an abomination to the Lord.* Is it possible, a Scripture should be produced, more destructive to the design of the bringer? is it an abomination that the wicked should be justified? and shall we affix such a thing on the righteous God? can no Judge acquit the guilty without a satisfaction, but he must act that which in its own

nature

nature is an abhorrency? and shall we ascribe this to the holy and righteous Governour of the world. See the foregoing Treatise from pag. 8. to 16. But I suppose the Gentleman thought of serving himself by one part of the Text, not considering how ruinous to his whole enterprise the other part would prove; and indeed there is nothing more usual with that sort of men, than to urge their mistaken sense of one part of Scripture, to the overthrow of the true meaning of another, but to reply to the place.

(1.) I deny that it is against justice to condemn one that is *personally* innocent, when he hath put himself *legally* in the room of criminals. It is no ways against equity to send a person to prison, who possibly may live & dy there and have his whole posterity begger'd, who never contracted one penny debt of his own, only became

came bound for another? So here though Christ was personally innocent, yet he stood legally in the room of the guilty, and it was that which he had chosen, and in a matter wherein he had as much power as any of us have in our estates; see before from pag. 93. to 107.

(2.) I affirm that these words which the Adversary seeks relief to his cause from, do utterly subserve it; *For if he that condemneth the just be an abomination to the Lord*; how will they salve the righteousness of God in condemning Christ who was an innocent person to pain and death, which is the punishment of the nocent, who as he had no sin of his own, so according to them, he stood charged with no sin of ours? Death being constituted the penalty of sin, could not without unrighteousness have been inflicted upon Christ, for as much

much as he had become answera-
ble for ours; see this proved pag.
124. to 127. And therefore our
adversaries by denying the last,
and not daring to assert the first,
are the only men who fasten that
upon God, which the Text stiles
abominable; and now we hope
that we have not only wrested
these weapons out of the enemies
hand, but also wounded himself
by them.

SECT. II.

The guilty of any of the three faults inexcusable in a Preacher. The doctrine momentous, Heb. 2. 10. opened, and the necessity of a satisfaction justified to be the truth of that Scripture.

THE three faults proposed
as inexcusable in a Preacher,
too confessedly so, to be apo-
lized for: but whatever other
darkness, I may have been guil-
ty of, yet that I am innocent

from the whole of that charge comes now to be justified.

1. *That the Doctrine I discourse of is of the highest import, and that to mistake in it, is to erre in a matter of the greatest concernment.* I readily acknowledge, and do further add, that it is of such weight in the matter of a Christians belief, that not to be found there, is to erre in a main fundamental, and consequently to be unavoidably obnoxious to damnation. Where as their are some truths which we are only bound to believe in case we know them to be revealed; this is a truth we are bound to know and believe to be revealed, in order to be saved. If there be any fundamentals of faith at all, these Doctrines wherein we and the Socinians differ, are maximes of that nature. As to that exception I have heard of a certain person whose name out of respect I

ear, that they cannot be funda-
mentals, becauſe controverted by
earned men; if it concludes any
hing, it concludes that there is
o fundamental at all, there being
o one truth ſo evident, which
ome have not denied: yea, it
ill not be a fundamental that
ere is God, forasmuch as there
ve been ſome, and ſtill are, who
re gainſay it. The matter then
herein my Adverſary and I differ,
ing of this moment, I would
er it to the Reader to arbitrate;
whoſe ſide the truth lies; whe-
r with them who can demon-
rate their Opinion to have been
belief of all the faithful down
m the Apoſtles to the preſent
, not one diſſenting, who hath
been by all the Churches of
riſt branded for a Heretick; or
th thoſe who in ſome whole
es can inſtance none of the ſame
timents with them, and thoſe
om in other times they pro-

duce are such as the Catholick Church hath from time to time voted unworthy the name of Christians.

2. *Whether the Doctrine I there insist d on, be the truth of any Scripture*, the former tract hath accounted for, where I hope it is not only made evident to be a truth but one of the most considerable truths of the Gospel, the very basis of our Religion, the foundation of our present comforts and future hopes.

3. *The third, and at present most particular, and that which is now under consideration is, whether it be the truth of that Text, from which in my Sermon I deduced it.*

And here I must complain of the unworthiness and disingenuity of my Adversaries, that when I had endeavoured at some length to prove, that the point then insisted on, arose not only naturally from the place, but was one of the

m

main doctrines intended in the words, they have been so far from refuting what was alledged to that purpose, that they have not mentioned one word of what was offered in that matter. Was ever such *tergiversation* known, as publickly to reproach a person for a conclusion, without examining either the premises whence it is drawn, or the method of inferring it? The least I could have expected, was either the overthrowing the principles upon which I raised it, or else the evidencing some mistake in the way of deduction. At this rate of procedure, there is no truth deducible from any Text of the Bible, but by saying it is not rightly drawn, they may with the same facility refute. The Reader had been spared this labour, if my adversaries had been but so just, as in common honesty they ought, namely, if when they declaimed against my doctrine, they had ta-

ken notice of the foundations upon which I raised it: but seeing they have put me upon this task, the speediest way to bring it to an issue, will be to open the Text I then discoursed on, viz. *Heb.* 2. 10. *For it became him for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings.* The Apostle in the preceding Chapter having largely treated of Christ as supream Prophet, and having advanced him above all other ministerial revealers of God's will, so far as a Son is preferable to a servant, after some improvement made in the beginning of this Chapter of what he had delivered to that purpose in the foregoing by an admirable thread and fineness of wisdom he slides from the Prophetical office of Christ to his Sacerdotal: and having affirmed that Christ through the benignity and

grac

grace of God was given to taste and suffer death for men, he here assigns the impulsive reason or procuring cause of Christ's suffering, *it became God, &c.* i. e. if God would save sinners his essential justice and righteousness could not allow that it should be otherways. That this is the intendment of the words a little further opening of them will confirm. We have first then a design of God towards fallen rebellious mankind, and *that is the bringing many of them as sons to glory.* The making a company of enemies who lay obnoxious to hell and wrath, to be God's Sons, and the bringing them to life. Secondly, We have the method and means pitched on for the compassing of that design, and *that is the dedicating and consecrating Christ by suffering to be a Captain of salvation,* τελειωσαι, we render it to make perfect, and that sense sometimes it hath, but it signifieth here

to consecrate or dedicate unto an office, and in this sense the Septuagint use it, Exod. 29. 33. and Lev. 21. 10. — [illegible] And the same Apostle several times in this Epistle, see Chap. 5. 9. [illegible] *consecration*, Ver. *being consecrate or set apart, he became the author of eternal salvation*, &c. And chap. 7. 28. [illegible] consecrated, hence Baptisme among the Greek Fathers was called [illegible] and [illegible], because they were thereby consecrated and dedicated to the service of Christ. This was the method pitched on by God for the bringing sinners to glory; namely, the dedicating and setting apart Christ by sufferings to be a leader and Saviour. 3*ly*. *We have the ground and reason of the procedure of God, in making Christ to suffer, and therein consecrating him to be a Captain.* [illegible] *became God*, &c. [illegible] *decebat*. It was just and meet, and upon

suppo-

supposition that God would save sinners, it could not without injustice otherwise be. The word signifies frequently that which is incumbent upon one and ought to be done: πρέπουσα ζημία, *pœna quam infligi decet & par est*, πρέποντα, are often equivalent to δίκαια and ἀναγκαῖα. It signifieth in many places that which is so decent and meet, that either the omission of it, or the commission of the contrary is unjust and evil, *Ephes.* 5. 3. 1 *Tim.* 2. 10. *Tit.* 2. 1. *Mat.* 3. 15. And in this sense our Apostle useth it elsewhere in this very Epistle *chap.* 7. 26. *For such an high Priest became us, who is holy, harmless, &c.* It was just and necessary that our High Priest should be such an one, otherwise he had neither been fit Priest nor Sacrifice. So that the clear intendment of this expression, *it became him*, is, that upon supposition that God would save sinners, the holiness and justice

fice of his nature required, that it should be by constituting Christ to suffer in their stead, and so to become the Author and Captain of their salvation. This is admirably strengthened from the next words, it became God for *whom are all things, and by whom are all things*; where we have clearly the rise and ground of this *becomingness*, or the necessity of God's acting after this manner, in case he would recover man; a little opening of the words will fully enlighten the whole matter. Man being *of God*, and made by him an intellectual and rational creature, in an aptitude and fitness for moral government, it was necessary that he should appoint him to be *for him*, that is, that he should govern him, and accordingly prescribe him a law by which he should signifie his own will, and declare man's duty: Now man having broken the law of his creation

creation, and therein ſhaken off his dependance upon God, and his obedience to him as Governour, it was meet and right that God as Rector and Governour ſhould puniſh this rebellion and diſobedience; for if this rebellion ſhould not be puniſhed, either God were not the Governour of the world, or elſe he governs it not in juſtice, and therefore on ſuppoſition that he would not inflict the puniſhment on men himſelf, but that he would recover him by Jeſus Chriſt to be *for him* again, it was neceſſary that Chriſt ſhould be made ſuffer in their ſtead. So that by this time I hope the Reader will be ſatisfied, that the doctrine then inſiſted on, was not only agreeable to other Scriptures, but the very truth of the Text I drew it from: *Neither is there any ſuch vaſt difference betwixt the terms of the text and the doctrine*, but that a perſon unpreposſeſſed, provided he be inſighted

ſighted into Scripture may eaſily reconcile them. *As to that he ſays that ſuppoſing Chriſt hath made ſatisfaction, yet that it doth not follow, but that we might have been ſaved otherwiſe, &c.* I anſwer, God was under no neceſſity of ſaving us at all, he was free to have damned us, as well as to ſave us; but ſuppoſing that he would ſave us, it was neceſſary he ſhould ſave us, in ways agreeable to his juſtice and holineſs. Though he was under an abſolute freedom whether he would do it or not, yet he was not under a freedom whether he ſhould do it in a way of righteouſneſs or not. The firſt abſolutely depended upon his *will*, but he is reſtrained as to the ſecond by his *nature*. And therefore when my Adverſary can ſhow me, how the juſtice of God could have been ſatisfied without the intervention of the ſufferings of Chriſt, I ſhall then think my ſelf

o have been too presumptuous
nd dogmatical in my doctrine,
ut forasmuch as he hath not hi-
herto attempted it, and I am
ure will never be able to perform
, I abide in my former persuasion,
viz. that there was no other way
ossible for God to bring sinners to
lory, but by the death and sufferings
f Christ, who was set apart and
onsecrate to be the Author and Ca-
tain of salvation.

Whereas he says, that the intend-
ment of the Text is only Christ's be-
ng a Captain to lead, pity, assist,
nd supply his people. I absolute-
y deny it, it is only part of the in-
ndment of the Holy Ghost in
he place, but not the whole; yea,
e had never been a Captain of sal-
ation to us, but in the way, and
pon the termes of making God a
atisfaction: It was only by this
eans that he was consecrate to
e a Leader. And I would have it
bserved, that the doctrine I pro-

pounded

pounded was the very scope of the whole verse, which is a better way of deducing doctrines, than to draw them from words and expressions. Not that I deny but one may rationally offer from them, that Christ is our Captain, but I affirm that his being so is only consequential upon his undertaking, and being ordained to make satisfaction. *So that upon the whole, the Adversary hath both wronged the truth and me, in affirming my Doctrine neither to have been in the Text, nor yet deducible from it.*

SECT. III.

Forgiveness upon a satisfaction, not contradictory to it self. Nor to the Scripture. The freeness of pardon not inconsistent with a satisfaction. Its being attributed to grace, doth not overthrow its being paid for.

The first attempt made by the amphleter against the satisfacti- n of Christ, is, that it is contra- ictory to it self, forasmuch as to xact satisfaction for sin, and yet ot to impute sin, are destructive ie of another. pag. 6.

I Answer, that to exact satis- ction for sin of *us*, and not to npute sin *to us*, would be con- radictories; and Heaven and arth might be as soon blended ogether, as that these two hould Harmonize and meet: ut to exact satisfaction from hrist, and on consideration of hat, not to impute sin to us, e no wayes contradictory. ontradictories must alwayes e in reference to the same ing, or person. The satis- ction is not exacted of us, it as only exacted of Christ; d it is to us that sin is not puted, but it was imputed to m; for he had it laid on him,

and was made legally to answe
for it, *Isa.*53.6.2 *Cor.*5.21. now
the demanding satisfaction from
Christ, upon his being charged
with our sins, and the not im-
puting sin to us upon conside-
ration of the satisfaction which
he hath made, are so far from
being contradictories, that the
conspiration of these two toge-
ther is the very summ of the
Gospel. A short acquaintance
either with Scripture or reaso
will salve these from being con
tradictions.

*And whereas he adds, that t
pardon sin, and yet to demand
satisfaction, is alike as if we shoul
say, that a King cannot pardon
Rebell without punishing as th
Law requires, when in the mea
time to pardon, is not to punish
the Law requires.*

I Reply, (1.) It is observa
ble that these Gentlemen insi
always upon the word *Pardo*
withou

without taking ever notice of the Word *juſtifie*; whereas the Scriptures every where inform us, that we are *juſtified*, as well as pardoned; which implyes that we are dealt with according to Law, as well as Grace: that right, as well as mercy meet in this affair. (2.) There is no arguing from what man does, to what God may do; both becauſe men are only reſtrained by *Law*, which is often *arbitrary*, whereas God is confined by his *nature*, which is *unalterable*; as likewiſe becauſe men and juſtice are two diſtinct things, but juſtice and God are the ſame. A man is a man, though he ceaſeth to be righteous; but God, if he ſhould ceaſe to be juſt, he would ceaſe to be God. (3.) There are caſes wherein men without the higheſt unrighteouſneſs cannot pardon; as a Son ſhould kill his Father,

it were the grossest injustice not to punish it; and if in men it be against justice not to punish vice, we must suppose it to be so in God, or else we separate righteousness from his nature. (4.) I affirm that a State may both pardon a Rebel, and yet punish his Rebellion; as supposing they have *mulct* a person in a 1000. Talents, of which he is not able to pay one farthing, and that then one or two of the Senate pay the mulct; here is mercy to the criminal, and severity against the crime, for they who paid the fine, being a part of the Senate who inflicted it, they at once express grace to the offender, and justice against his offence. The Story of *Zaleucus* is not in this case impertinent.

As to what he adds, That no man would account himself pardoned a debt, if either he, or

ano

another paid it in his name.

I Answer, (1.) There are cases wherein it is possible that the debtor may be pardoned, and yet the debt paid; as in case he that paid it was not procured by the Debtor himself, nor did it at his entreaty, but was rather assigned by the Creditor. (2.) These Gentlemen all a long confound pecuniary debts with pœnal; and a meer Creditor, with a Governour, which is wilfully to err in the case; see the foregoing discourse, *pag.* 50. to 58. sin is *properly* a *crime*, and only *metaphorically* a *debt*; and God is *properly* a *Governour*, and only *metaphorically* a Creditor. Now the Socinians desert the proper consideration both of sin, and God; and in this whole affair, pursue only the metaphorical; which in plain English is to resolve to mistake. Thus we have

ſeen that the Doctrine of forgiveneſs upon a ſatisfaction, is not contradictory to it ſelf.

Let us ſee in the next place whether it be diſagreeable to the Scripture; and firſt the adverſary repreſents it as contrary to thoſe Scriptures, which ſpeak of Gods pardoning, forgiving and remitting ſins, through Jeſus Chriſt, or through his blood; and here he quotes ſeveral places, where there is mention of forgiveneſs, and remiſſion in the blood of Chriſt; as Luk. 3. 3. Mat. 26. 28. Act. 2. 38. and 3. 19. and 5. 31. and 10. 43. and 13. 38.

To all which I Anſ. (1.) That theſe Scriptures are ſo far from being ſerviceable to the deſign they were brought for, that they are deſtructive of it; for we have already demonſtrated, that to be pardoned *in the name of Chriſt*, and through *the blood of Chriſt*, is to be pardoned upon a ſa-

a ſatisfaction, and by vertue of Chriſts blood as a price and ranſome. (2.) This whole Argument runs upon the old miſtake, which we have ſo oft taken notice of, *viz.* that ſin cannot be forgiven, becauſe it is ſatisfied for, whereas ſatisfaction is ſo far from diminiſhing the freeneſs of forgiveneſs, that it exalts it: it is the more free to us, that it was bought by Chriſt; God expreſſeth more grace in giving Chriſt to purchaſe it, then (ſuppoſing it had been poſſible) if he had remitted ſin without the intervention of ſuch inducement and means: *majus beneficium, quod cum tanta moleſtia præſtitum.* The freeneſs of remiſſion is ſo far from being hereby darkned, that it is rendred the more illuſtrious. For us to have bought it, had been altogether inconſiſtent with its being free; but for

Christ to have bought it, enhanceth its freedom.

As to what he adds, That we are taught to Pray, That God would forgive us our Debts, as we forgive our Debtors, Matth. 6. 12. *and that our Heavenly Father forgives us our Trespasses, as we forgive men theirs.*

I Answer, that in these places, *res comparatur cum re, non modus cum modo.* We are to distinguish betwixt *mercy*, and the *manner* of mercy. The *as* is not a *note* of universal parity, but a note of some similitude; we are to be sincerely merciful, as God is, but in the manner of bestowing mercy, God takes one way, and we another; this is evident in that we are obliged to forgive our enemies, though they abide Enemies, whereas this Gentlemans friends confess (and I suppose he will not dissent from the Tribe) that God

God cannot in honour forgive ſin, but in caſe of repentance.

As to the Parable which he quotes, Matth. 18. 32, 33. I Anſwer, We muſt not ſet Parables upon more feet than they will go, nor compel them more miles than they do intend. The ſcope of a Parable is alwayes the Key of it: and the ſcope of this, is only to ſhew that they who are implacable to their Brethren, ſhall find others implacable to them; and that they who expect mercy to be ſhewn to them, ſhould expreſs mercy to others. But the intendment of it is neither to ſhew that God is a meer Creditor, nor that he forgives ſin without a ſatisfaction, but at moſt that he hath received no ſatisfaction from us.

Having ſeen the Adverſaries faileur in this aſſault, let us try the next. To forgive ſin upon a ſatisfaction,

Satisfaction, is contrary to all the Scriptures which attribute our salvation to the grace mercy and kindness of God, and to prove this, several Scriptures are brought, Exod. 34. 5, 6, 7. Psal. 103. 8, 10, 13. Jer. 3. 3. Joel 2. 3. Jonah 4. 2. 2 Cor. 1. 3. Luk. 1. 77, 78. Eph. 1. 7. Col. 1. 14. Rom. 3. 24.

For Answ. Let not the Reader be surprised with the multitude of Scriptures misalledged! the letter of Scripture, brought against the intendment of the spirit of God in it, is not Scripture. He does here as before *Eadem semper oberrare chorda* that remission and Salvation are of Grace, we readily acknowledge and affirm, but that therefore Christ hath not satisfied, is a meer *non-sequitur*. There is not the least contrariety betwixt satisfaction, and grace, but they are the one subordinate

ordinate to the other. The fulleſt and freeſt grace in the giving Chriſt to ſatisfie, in the accepting that ſatisfaction in our ſtead, and applying the merit of it to our ſouls, and yet ſtill the holineſs and juſtice of Gods nature was ſuch, as that he could not pardon ſin without a ſatisfaction: the conſiſtency of theſe two is largely treated and opened before, and we referr the Reader thither, to avoid repetition here.

But ſaith the adverſary, there is nothing more contrary to grace, than to give nothing but what is paid for.

Anſw. It is true, if the payment had been taken of us, to whom the favour is ſhewn; or if the ſatisfaction had been of our contriving and procuring; but nothing being paid by us, nor the leaſt influence of ours into the affair. It was meer

grace

grace that was the impulsive cause, of Gods giving Christ, *Joh.* 3. 16. 1 *Joh.* 4. 9, 10. *Rom.* 5. 8. It was meer grace that gave him for such a number, *Joh.* 17. 19. (to sanctifie there, is to separate and set himself apart to dye, as Joh. 10. 36. Heb. 10, 29.)

But there is one text that the Gentleman seems to reckon on, more than the rest, it is Jam. 2. 13. — *and mercy rejoyceth against judgement; where he saith mercy is opposed to satisfaction.*

Answ. (1.) It is not certain whether by mercy, we are to understand Gods mercy, or mans; many Interpreters understand the last. (2.) Granting him his principle, that it is to be understood of Gods mercy, yet I deny his inference, that therefore there is no satisfaction; in order to the better understanding of these, I say that as justice is an attribute of God, he hath no

no leſs of that, than of mercy; he is as juſt as he is gracious, that is, he is infinitely both: but if we take mercy for the effects of his mercy, then, in this life God is more ready to ſhew effects of mercy, than of juſtice; hence the Lord is now ſaid to be ſlow to anger; and the preſent time, is called the time of long-ſufferance: whereas the day of Judgement is called the day of wrath. God is infinite as well as merciful, but the meaning of the Text is, that in this life he is more in the diſcoveries of his mercy, than his juſtice; but this is ſo far from excluding a ſatisfaction, that it ſuppoſeth it. There is one Scripture I made uſe of in my Sermon, *viz.* Exod. 34. 7. *and that will by no means clear the guilty.* Which the adverſary would wreſt out of my hand, but without giving the leaſt

leaſt reaſon, to prove that it
otherwayes applicable, than
applyed it. As mercy is a pro
perty of Gods nature, ſo
juſtice: ſin is contrary to God
and his nature inclines him t
puniſh it. It is remarkable tha
Socinus himſelf acknowledg
eth, that where the ſinne
is obſtinate, God canno
but puniſh him; now obſti
nacy in reference to its own
nature is not puniſhable
for obſtinacy in good (be
ing nothing but conſtancy)
is laudable; and therefore
obſtinacy is not puniſhed for
it ſelf, but only in reference
to evil; and conſequently it is
evil which is puniſhable, and
which God cannot but puniſh,
and obſtinacy is only puniſhable
in reſpect of ſin, to which it is
joyned. And thus we have
ſeen that to pardon ſin upon
a ſatisfaction, is neither contrary

to

to it ſelf, nor to other Scriptures.

SECT. IV.

Arguments for the neceſſity of a ſatisfaction vindicated, that from the truth of Gods threatning juſtified. Likewiſe thoſe from the holineſs and juſtice of God; the nature of ſin; and Gods being Governour; vindicated from the adverſaries exceptions.

HAving ſeen the impertinency of the Gentlemans own Arguments, and how inſufficient they are to eſtabliſh what he intended by them; let us ſee next how happy he will prove in the anſwering (as he ſtiles them) my Argumentations. Though I muſt tell the Reader,

Reader, that he hath abuſed both the World, and me, in calling a few notes imperfectly taken, and that by a profeſſed Enemy, my Sermon; and impoſing upon his Readers only the ſhreds of Arguments, for the ſumm of what I produced: ſure the man had either an itch to be in Print, or was in an humour of quarrelling. But if he took theſe for my Reaſons, he had both loſt his own Reaſon and his Conſcience; and he that takes his Replyes for Anſwers, either never ſuſpected the controverſie, or elſe hath a mind to be deceived. But this being a confident age, and thoſe I have to do with, being a ſort of men who ſuppoſe their dreams ſhould paſs for demonſtrations, every thing they ſay, however inconſiderable, muſt be attended to.

1. *Whereas*

1. *Whereas I argued from the truth of Gods threatning against the pardonableneſs of ſin without a ſatisfaction, he deſires to know where the threatning alloweth a ſurety?* P. 10.

Anſw. The Texts I produced namely, *Gen.* 2. 17. (not 1. 17. as the adverſary miſciteth it) and *Deut.* 27. 26. hold clearly forth Gods judicial denunciation of puniſhment againſt ſin, but the purpoſe of God for the execution of it upon the ſinner, is not there expreſt: and that this was not the intendment of it, in reference to all, the event demonſtrates, in that it is not executed upon the Elect, and yet it behoved to be executed againſt ſin, otherwiſe the truth and juſtice of God ſhould have failed: and therefore the Adverſary muſt either deny ſalvation to the Elect, or truth in God. It being then obtained

that the threatning abides firm, God himſelf is the beſt interpreter of his own meaning in it, and this he hath done in the Goſpel, both in reference to the ſtability of the Law it ſelf, *Rom.* 3. 31. and alſo in reference to the execution of it upon Chriſt, 1 *Cor.* 5. 21. *Gal.* 3. 13. 1 *Pet.* 3. 18. To render this clearer, I deſire the Reader to obſerve that threatnings do primarily ſignifie only the dueneſs of puniſhment; not that God will alwayes execute it upon the offender: God might altogether releaſe his threatnings, were he not reſtrained by his holineſs, wiſdom, righteouſneſs, and honour, and it being againſt none of all theſe to releaſe the perſonal offender, ſeeing by puniſhing ſin (though in another than the perſonal offenders) he both ſecures his honour, and at once gives evi-

dence

dence of the purity of his nature in the hatred of ſin, and of the wiſdom and righteouſneſs of his Government, in the execution of his Law.

But he adds, that the Scripture ſaith, The ſoul that ſinneth ſhall dye, Ezek. 18. 4. *and therefore that it is againſt truth it ſelf, to affirm that another dies in his room.* P. 10.

Anſw. The intendment of that place cannot be, that never any was, or ſhould, or might be made ſuffer for anothers ſin, for the Scripture furniſheth us with an expreſs threatning, *Exod.* 20. 5. and alſo many inſtances to the contrary: but the meaning of the place is, that whereas a company of wretches had raiſed a Proverbial reproach on the providence of God, namely, that their Fathers having been the only offenders, yet they were the ſuffer-

ers, *v.* 2. *Lament.* 5. 7. (1.) He either tells them that hereafter they ſhould not have that occaſion to complain, foraſmuch as he intended to be more ſpeedy in the execution of judgements upon the immediate offenders. Or (2.) That there ſhould be no more cauſe for that report, there being an end put to the captivity and thoſe calamities which occaſioned it.

P. 10. *Whereas the Gentleman bids me take heed of the curſe denounced againſt him that addeth to the Scripture, becauſe in the opening of ſome Texts*, I mentioned *ſurety*.

Anſw. *Surety* is a part of one Scripture Text, *Heb.* 7. 22. and in reference to others, I only mention it as a true *explication* of the words, not as a part of them; as a conſequence naturally ariſing from them, not as lying in ſo many ſyllables in them. And he cannot be of

fende

ſended with this method of diſputing, without condemning the procedure of Chriſt who hath gone before us in this way of Argumentation, *Mat.* 22.31, *&c.*

2. *He ſayes that I Reaſon from the condecency that was in it to the wiſdom, righteouſneſs, and other attributes of God, to pardon ſin upon a compenſation.* P. 11.

Anſw. I ſuppoſe the Gentleman truſted to his Friends account, but he was diſingenuous in relying upon ſo ſlender information, and his Friend was unworthy in abuſing him, the world, and me; there was not any ſuch thing *delivered* in the Sermon, as is here alledged, whereof the beſt evidence, will be the preſenting what was truly *delivered*. In my diſcourſing the ſatisfaction of Chriſt, I alledged the ſeveral wayes which were inſiſted on, in the affair, particularly that there were many,

who though they believed that other wayes of saving sinners were not wanting to the divine wisdom, yet that the saving us, by the satisfaction of Christ had a great condecency in it to the honouring of the divine perfections, this was at large treated, and many Scriptures which I then judged very pertinent and serviceable to the design, were produced; but forasmuch as none of them save one, are taken notice of, I am not concerned to repeat, much less to vindicate them; and as for that which he cites, namely, *Rom.* 3. 25, 26. we have already secured it, and evidently shewn that justifying *gratis*, is very consistent with a plenary compensation. See Sect. 1.

P. 11. 3. *But I disputed from the holiness, purity, and righteousness of Gods nature to the necessity of punishing sin.*

Answ

Anſw. I did ſo, and how pertinently, I leave to the forgoing diſcourſe to inſtruct, from p. 45. to 51.

But ſaith he, is it not as much P. 11. *againſt holineſs*, and juſtice for God to puniſh the innocent, as it is to acquit the guilty?

Anſw. We have proved before that it is no wayes againſt juſtice to lay pains upon an innocent, providing, there be a concurrence of ſuch conditions, as we there mentioned, ſee *p.* 94. to 107. I ſhall now therefore only reaſſume one thing, and enlarge it; namely, that there is no wrong done to a willing perſon, eſpecially in a matter wherein he hath full dominion; and Chriſt was admirably willing, there neither was, nor could be any neceſſity laid on him, it was his own election and choice, *Prov.* 8. 31. he freely tendred himſelf to it,

Pſal. 40. 7. his will was as forward in the undertaking, as the Father's was; he entred upon the work with cheerfulneſs, *Pſal.* 40. 8. and was bent upon the accompliſhing of it, *Luke* 12. 51. he voluntarily put his name into the obligation, though then he became in duty reſponſible for the whole debt.

P. 12. *Whereas the adverſary calls this horrible cruelty*, &c.

I dare not return him the Anſwer which he deſerves, remembring that railing did not become the Angels mouth, though the devil deſerved it, *Jude.* 9. I ſhall only joyn iſſue in that Prayer, *Zech.* 3. 2. How the ſufferings of Chriſt were a valuable compenſation, for the ſins of all thoſe, in whoſe behalf he ſuffered, the Adverſary is far from underſtanding, and is too far prejudiced to learn. To thoſe who are humble and teachable

teachable it is enough to know that he was *God-man*, God over all, *Rom.* 9. 5. the true God, 1 *Joh.* 5.20. and that his blood was the blood of God, *Rom.* 20. 28. and that he offered up himself through the eternal spirit, *Heb.* 9. 14. there was a real condignity in the price paid, to attone for the offence committed, and to purchase the mercy obtained.

Though we abhorr such unsa- P. 12.
voury expressions, as the putting the thousands of pounds of his God-head, into the scale with the penny of his man-hood; yet we affirm that the dignity of his person, puts an infinite worth upon whatever he did or suffered. His satisfaction is the satisfaction of God, and it is that which the infinite God is satisfied with; he looks for no more, nor better; yea there can neither be more, nor better.

better. The reſt which th
Adverſary in reference to thi
head ſuggeſteth, I refer it t
any Reader whether it be an
thing elſe, than a bundle o
blaſphemy and nonſenſe.

P. 12. That which he next falls up
on, is my aſſerting in caſe o
pardon, the neceſſity of a ſatis
faction from the nature of ſin
and how effectual the Argumen
is to that end, I referr to th
preceding diſcourſe, pag. 42.
to 45. *Two things the Gentlema
here objects*, (1.) *That if ſo, the
the puniſhment ought to be inflicte
upon the criminal.*

Anſw. This he could not bu
know, if he knew any thing
that we would deny, and ye
not the leaſt word added for th
proof of it. This then is o
eaſie diſpatch; for we affirm
that though it be neceſſary tha
ſin ſhould be puniſhed, yet it i
not indiſpenſably needfull, tha

ſhould be puniſhed in the perſon who offends, let him rationally attempt the probation of the contrary, and I aſſure him he ſhall be attended to.

(2.) *That ſuppoſe ſin doth in its own nature, deſerve puniſhment, yet this doth not neceſſitate God to puniſh ſin.* P. 12.

Anſw. (1.) If by neceſſity, they mean coaction, or a neceſſity inconſiſtent with Gods counſel, purpoſe, and will, we confeſs God cannot be ſubject to any ſuch brutal neceſſity; but if by neceſſity, they mean (as they ought) a rational neceſſity, a neceſſity not deſtructive of freedom; as God neceſſarily loves himſelf, and yet freely does it: the glorified Saints neceſſarily magnifie and praiſe God, and yet moſt freely: the Devils ſin neceſſarily, and yet from freedom and choice: In this ſenſe we affirm

God

God is neceſſarily inclined to puniſh ſin; his nature inclines him to puniſh it, yet ſo as that he wills, purpoſeth, and decrees the puniſhing of it. (2.) This Gentleman confounds juſtice with the effects of it; actual puniſhing, with the principle whence it ariſeth and proceeds: actual puniſhing depends upon the divine decree, but the inclination to puniſh is founded in the divine nature.

P. 12. *He adds that we men have a natural right to our Limbs, and he that maims us deſerves to be puniſhed, yet notwithſtanding we may forgive the offence.*

Anſw. (1.) There be caſes wherein being wronged, we cannot without injuſtice forgive, but are bound to proſecute revenge upon the offender; ſee *pag.* 53. of the former diſcourſe. (2.) He argues from what a private perſon may do,

to

o what God who is the ſu-
ream Rector and Governour
ught to do; whereas even
mong men, that which is law-
ull for a private perſon, is not
awfull for a Magiſtrate, *vid.*
bi ſupra. (2.) The Gentleman
n this whole affair confounds
s & juſtitia, power and equi-
y. We may have a phyſical
ower to do that, which we
ave not a moral right to do.
A Father may (if we ſpeak as
o power) connive at rebelli-
n in his Son; but it is mo-
ally wicked, and deſtructive
f Paternal Government to do
o; ſo here we do not argue
bout the unlimited power of
God, what in a way of abſo-
uteneſs he may do, but
hat in agreeableneſs to his
uſtice, wiſdom and holineſs, is
t for him to do.

Whereas he adds that ſins give P. 12.
od a right to puniſh, but that he
may

may diſpenſe with his right, if he pleaſe, or elſe he were more impotent than we contemptible worms are.

Anſw. (1.) If this prove anything, it will prove more than the Adverſary deſires, namely, that God may forgive the obſtinate and impenitent, ſeeing we not only can, but in ſome caſes are bound ſo to do; but the contrary hereof, both *Socinus* and *Crellius* affirm, and I ſuppoſe the Diſciple will not vary from his Maſters. (2.) It is true that he who ſins, gives God right to puniſh him, and that God may remit his right, but then it muſt be upon terms which may ſecure his honour: now it is againſt his honour to do it otherwiſe, than upon the conditions we alledge, and upon theſe we affirm, that it is demonſtration of his grace, how doth it. Neither is it through

im

impotency that God cannot otherwayes act, but through infiniteneſs of perfection.

His next aſſault, is upon my Argument from the nature of God, and the account that the Scriptures give us of it, *in reference to ſin and ſinners, to which purpoſe I cited,* 2 Theſ. 1. 6, 7. *upon which he replyes, that God is ſaid to be righteous in recompencing reſt to them who are troubled, as well as tribulation to them who trouble; but foraſmuch as that is not from the neceſſity of Gods nature, but from his merciful determination; ſo neither is this from the inclination of his nature, but the pleaſure of his will.* P. 13.

Anſw. (1.) God having promiſed to reward obedience, cannot without faileur in his veracity and truth, but perform it; for though his promiſe was an act of *grace*, yet the keeping of it is an act of *juſtice*, and there-

therefore the Scripture asserts that God cannot otherwise do without being false and unrighteous, *Heb.*6.10. 2 *Tim.*4.8. and by consequence God having threatned to punish sin, is obliged by his veracity to do no less; his truth is as prevalent with him in the one case, as in the other: so that this exception is so far from prejudicing us that it clearly overthrows his cause who brought it. (2.) God being infinitely good, is enclined by his nature to love vertue, and though it were not against his justice not to reward it, forasmuch as it is impossible that a creature should lay an obligation upon its maker, yet it is that which his wisdom and goodness will not admit him to do. How much more then is it contrary to his nature, not to punish sin, that being formally against his justice, as well as unbecoming

becoming his wisdom. (3.) We affirm that there is a difference betwixt obedience and sin as to the point of ones being punished, and the other rewarded; for we owe the utmost of Service to God, as we are his creatures, and withall there is that in the nature of duty, which deserves that it should be pursued; but in the contrary sin is so far from being a debt which we owe to God, that he commands us on the highest perill to avoid it; and there is nothing in the nature of sin, that should invite us to commission of it; and withall is contrary both to Gods nature, and government, and therefore though God be obliged by his nature to punish sin, yet he is under no such obligation to reward obedience, obedience being a debt we owe to God as our maker and ruler, whereas sin is both an opposing

his nature, and a rebelling against his Rectorship. The Apostle asserts the same distinction, Rom. 6. 23. *for the wages of sin is death: but the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.*

P. 13. *The next attempt, is upon my arguing for the necessity of sins punishment, from the sense and notion, which the Heathens without revelation have of it. Against which he excepts that the same light taught them that God was merciful pardoning sin, without a satisfaction.*

Answ. If we consider in this affair the sentiments of the Heathen, our Adversaries have clearly the disadvantage, for it is most certain that they believed God to be offended, and therefore sought by costly offerings, lustrations, &c. to appease him. (2.) We readily grant that the Heathens had some light of Gods being merciful

herei

herein he left himself nowhere without a witness, *Act.* 14. 17. and the common discoveries which he made of his goodness, were intended in a kind of *objective* way, and had a great tendency and usefulness to that purpose, to lead us to Repentance, *Rom.* 1. 19, 20. *Rom.* 2. 4. but that they had any notion of Gods pardoning sin without satisfaction, we deny and challenge him to prove it, if he can; yea their whole Worship implyed the contrary; to what end were all their Sacrifices, but, upon a steady belief of Gods being angry, to attone him? It is very remarkable that of all the parts and principles of justified Worship-Priesthood, and Sacrifice made the largest spread, there being scarce any People or Nation which hath arrived to our knowledge among whom we do not find

some Prints and footsteps of them. And though the Heathens mistook the right end of Sacrifices, yet the first Rise of them among them, was some traditional conveyance from the Church, to whom God enjoyned them as Types of the great Sacrifice of the Messiah.

As to what the Gentleman alledgeth in reference to the Ninivites, it is altogether impertinent.

(11.) In that it was but Gods withholding of a temporal judgment, and that also but for a time, for about forty years after they were destroyed, and their City taken and overthrown. (12.) All the mercy they could suppose in God, was only upon consideration of some effectual means and way to appease him, though they had no distinct notion of the right way and means, by which it was accomplished.

My

My last Argument, (why sin should not be pardoned without a satisfaction,) was from the consideration of Gods being Governour, and that if he should permit sin to go unpunished, his Laws would have been ridiculous. You may see this Argument managed at further length p. 48. to 51.

Against this he excepts, saying, P. 13.
all men hate and abhorr that Government as cruel and tyrannical, where every the least breach must be fully avenged.

Answ. That you may once for all see, at what kind of rate these Gentlemen dispute, I will ask him these Questions. (1.) Whether God might not have damned all mankind, without being a Tyrant or cruel? and yet I suppose, we should pronounce it cruelty in any Governour, to destroy all his subjects, even supposing

them guilty of a very hainous fault. (2.) Is it cruelty for God to condemn men for little sins, when continued in without repentance? (or will he say that there are some sins in their own nature Venial) and yet I think we should call it cruelty for a Magistrate to cut of his subjects for every little fault, though perseverd in. (3.) Are there not some cases, wherein Governours, without destroying the ends of Government and exposing their Laws to contempt, cannot forgive offences? and shall we call it Tyranny in God to secure the honour of his Government, and to preserve his Laws from reproach and derision. (4.) It no wayes follows that because men may in some cases pardon without a satisfaction, therefore God should; both because mens Laws are often arbitrary, and

in

in many cases only *ad terrorem* (where *summum jus*, would be *summa injuria*) as likewise because justice is of the nature of no Governour, but God.

Whereas he adds that I cited Gen. 18. 25. *in a quite contrary sense to its true meaning, because* Abraham *urged it against Gods destroying the few Righteous with the many wicked; but I urge for the many righteous, or of one equivalent to many, that a few wicked may go free.*

Answ. (1.) The end I produced it for, was that seeing sin in respect of its nature deserves punishment, therefore God as just Governour was obliged to see that it should have its due; and whatever the Gentleman sayes to the contrary, I do not see but that it was pertinently alledged. For seeing he ought as he is judge and Rector to do right, and punishment being

that which in right belongs to sin, he was bound to see that it should not miss it. (2.) *Abraham* treated with God only in and through Christ, and what ever was the matter of his Prayer, it was tendred in the vertue, and accepted through the merit of Christs Satisfaction; for it's only upon the consideration of the blood of Christ, that it becomes Righteous with God to pardon any. (3.) How Christ is equivalent to many, and how no pains were thrown upon him but upon his own election, and consequently how there was no cruelty in inflicting; what he had chosen to undergoe, is all at large before opened, and I have more mercy both for my self and my Reader than to repeat it. I know no more under this head added by my Adversary, but a Blasphemy which I care not

to

to mention, but shall leave it to God to avenge.

SECT. V.

The impossibility of having a satisfaction made any other way. Gods being reconciled to us. Christ's satisfying himself, bearing what we should have born. Doing it in our stead. Purchasing grace for us. All vindicated from the exceptions of the Adversary. The Conclusion of the whole.

HAving seen that a satisfaction is neither contradictory to it self, nor contrary to Scripture; and having vindicated what for the necessity of a satisfaction, in case of pardon I alledged in my Sermon; I had expected next a confuta-

tion

tion of what I produced to evidence the impossibility of its being made any other way; but I perceive that my Adversary out of a perswasion, that he had overthrown both the verity and the possibility of a satisfaction, passeth by all that I said on that occasion, as impertinent; save only two or three little things which he pretends to observe. *First*, That in citing *Psal.* 51. 16. *and* 50. 12. upon the warrant and authority of which; I disclaimed the possibility of satisfaction by Sacrifice. *I did not take notice of the sacrifice of a broken heart, and of thanksgiving*, &c. To which I Answer, (1.) That when I cite one verse in a chapter, I hold not my self concerned to cite every verse; I observed what was pertinent to the subject I was treating, and I suppose I was engaged to take notice

notice of no more. (2.) A broken heart, and thanksgiving are ſtiled Sacrifices only in a metaphorical ſenſe, as all believers are called Prieſts, *Rev.* 1. 6. and therefore to have named them under the head I was then handling, had been to have talk'd at the rate, which his Gentleman writes, that is, wildly and not to the purpoſe. (3.) To what end God appointed Sacrifices, in what reſpect he accepted, and in what ſenſe, and upon what account he rejected them; is largely before opened, *pag.* 63. *to* 69. and I love not to trouble either my ſelf, or the Reader with Repetitions.

His ſecond exception is in reference to my ſaying that Chriſt did, and ſuffered, what was a juſt compenſation for our releaſe; upon which he asks how we dare affirm, that God who loved his Son, more P. 14.

than

than millions of righteous men should yet lay upon him the punishment due to sinners.

Answ. He laid no more upon him than what himself chose to have laid on him, and what he knew him to be able to bear and overcome; but this whole matter being treated of above *pag.* 108. *to* 122. I wave here all further pursuing of it.

Having in my Sermon proposed several things, towards the proving Gods being reconciled to us, through the death of his Son; this fine disputant without once essaying to Answer one word of what I alledged, *confidently affirms that it is impossible to shew one Scripture, where Christ is said to reconcile God to us.*

P. 15.

Answ. The contrary is above demonstrated *p.* 166. &c. yea so happy is the Gentleman in his reasoning, that the two Texts which he here cites to the contrary,

rary, do demonstrate that very hing which he brought them to eſtroy, ſee *p.* 166. *&c.* for hough we have it not in ſo ma- words, yet we have the ing.

But he adds what need of recon- ling God, who ſo loved the world, at he gave his only begotten Son, h. 3. 16.

Anſw. God without any im- achment of his juſtice, did pity ankind, and find out a way for eir pardon and ſalvation, but tually to pardon and ſave em, he could not without a tisfaction. A judge ſeeing a lefactor condemned by the w, may out of ſome juſt in- cements ſo exceedingly pitty m, as to think of and contrive me way, whereby the Law y be ſatisfied, and the per- acquitted, yet actually he not releaſe him, unleſs he ll be unjuſt, till the Law

be

be satisfied. But this objecti-
on is fully answered before
p. 193. to 196.

*But he adds if Christ hath sa-
tisfied the Father, who hath satis-
fied the Son and the Holy Ghost?*

Answ. (1.) When we say
Christ hath satisfied the Father
we do not thereby intend to ex-
clude his having satisfied him-
self, and the Holy Ghost, so
when we use such expressions
we do not consider the Father
personally, but *essentially*; we do
not consider him in respect of
his distinct *subsistence* from the
Son and Spirit, but in respect
of the divine *essence*, wherein
Father, Son, and Spirit are *one*
as *Matth.* 6. 9. (2.) We affirm
that Christ hath satisfied him-
self, neither do we know any
absurdity in so saying; for be-
ing in this whole undertaking
considered as *God-man*, so there
is a distinct respect from himself

meer

meerly as God. But this being Replyed to before, *p.* 197. *to* 199. we ſhall not further inſiſt on it.

His next attempt is upon my ſaying, that Chriſt underwent that, which we ſhould have undergone: from whence he endeavours to inferr that upon theſe terms Chriſt ſhould have ſuffered for ever, and ſhould have deſpaired, &c. P. 15, 16.

Anſw. (1.) I would have it obſerved once for all, that this Gentleman never troubles himſelf to Anſwer my Arguments, only produceth a few frivolous cavils and exceptions: and indeed it is their way, if they can but darken the expoſitions which we give of Scripture, they never offer to aſſign an Expoſition of their own. Whereas I brought ſeveral Texts which I appehended full to the proof of Chriſts

bearing,

bearing, what we ſhould have born; not one word offered by way of formal Reply to any of them, only two or three general Cavils. (2.) It doth not follow that becauſe Chriſt bare, what we ſhould have born, therefore he behoved to ſuffer for ever, and deſpair, &c. as you may ſee fully opened, *p.* 107. *to* 111.

That the Agony of Chriſt proceeded not meerly from a foreſight of temporal death, was aſſerted and proved in my
P. 16. Sermon. *Now at this the Adverſary Cavils, but inſtead of alledging any thing to the purpoſe, he only tells us that Chriſt being our Captain, was to experience as great tryals, as his Souldiers meet with, and ſeeing they are often by their ſufferings, put into Agony, therefore it was convenient that in the ſame he by his example ſhould go before them.*

Anſw.

Anſw. Did ever a perſon who had not loſt his reaſon, argue ſo to the prejudice of his own cauſe, for (1.) Many of his Souldiers bear the worſt that befalls them, with leſs conſternation than he did: how many of the Martyrs have hugg'd their gibbets, and ſung in the flames; now ſurely if it had been only the apprehenſion and previſion of bodily death which influenced and operated upon Chriſt, it had been unworthy that leſs courage, fortitude, and ſpirit, ſhould diſcover it ſelf in the *Leader*, than doth in the followers. (2.) I think it will be hard if not impoſſible, to give one inſtance among all the Saints, who have in all particulars, expreſſed in their ſufferings, ſuch ſenſe, pain, anguiſh and grief as Chriſt did, which infallibly argues that he ſuffered what never any

of them did. (3.) There is a reason at hand, why the best of believers should manifest something of infirmity and weakness in their sufferings, because they are both *meer* and sinfull men, are not got to a full resignation of themselves to God, nor have that plenary assurance of support in their sufferings, and of glory after them; whereas Christ was not only *man* but *God*, had fully resigned himself to his Father, was infallibly certain of being born through his tryals, had the greatest inducements to cheerfulness in his sufferings, namely, the recovery of man, the vindicating his Fathers Law, Government, and honour, and was fully assured not only of a glorious issue but a reward; and therefore supposing that we poor worms should by sufferings, be thrown into fears and agonies,

is a *non sequitur* that Christ should.

After I had declared in my Sermon, that Christ suffered what we should have suffered, I endeavoured next to prove that he did it in our room, and to that end brought many Scriptures, three or four of which the Adversary is pleased to recite, but instead of invalidating the Exposition which I gave of them, or answering the arguments which were raised from them,

He only tells me (1.) *That in his judgement they are not the most probable I might have brought.* P. 17.

Answ. (1.) His judgement is of small value with me, neither am I to enquire of my Enemies, what Weapons I should fight with. (2.) That they are effectual and pertinent to the end they were brought for, I have before

proved; p. 128. to 141.

P. 17. He adds (2.) That he suffered for our example, 1 Pet. 2. 21.

Answ. It is confessed, but that that was either the only end, or the principal end of his sufferings is denyed: yea, if that had been the only end of his sufferings, it had not been necessary for him to have suffered at all; nay, it had not been agreeable to the goodness, justice, and wisdom of God, that he should have at all suffered. 3. but) see this discussed before, p. 80. to 89. and p. 88. to 92.

P. 17. He adds (3.) That he who doth any thing in another's stead, doth it, that the other may not do it.

Answ. Neither do we suffer to that (end, that Christ suffered. Our sufferings are only disciplinary, his were pœnal and satisfactory. Ours are the chastisements

chastisements of God as a Father, Christs were the punishments of God as a Judge.

But he adds (4.) *That he is said to have entred into Heaven for us*, Heb. 6. 20. *Which is to be understood of his doing it only for our good, not in our stead, and consequently that whenever he is said to have dyed, or have suffered for us, we are so to understand it, and not otherwise.* P. 17.

Answ. (1.) I deny the sequel, It is a strange kind of arguing, because a word hath such a signification sometimes, therefore it must alwayes signifie so. (2.) I have already proved that whatever significations it hath in other cases, yet when the sufferings of one for another are expresst by it, that it signifieth alwayes the substitution of one in the room of another,

p. 137, 138. and when the Gentleman hath overthrown what we have ſaid there to that effect; we ſhall judge him worthy to be hearkened to; in the mean time he ſpeaks nothing to the purpoſe.

The next thing he falls upon, is my alledging that Chriſt by vertue of the ſatisfaction which he had made, and the redundancy of merit which was in his obedience and ſuffering, had purchaſed grace for us, ſo that God in righteouſneſs was bound to give it to ſo many as he had bought it for, to which purpoſe I had cited, 2 *Pet.* 1. 1. Now what he brings by way of exception, will be rendred of eaſie diſpatch, by tendring an expoſition of that place. (1.) We have there an account of ſomething obtained, and that is

faith.

faith. (2.) We have the means and ground of obtaining it, *and that is through the righteouſneſs of God, and our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt*; ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος. *Some* interpret righteouſneſs in reference to Gods faithfullneſs in his promiſes; now all Gods promiſes of grace are founded in Chriſt, 2 *Pet.* 1. 4. and through him it is, that they are ſtable and firm, 2 *Cor.* 1. 20. and as in conſideration of his merit, it is matter of juſtice in God to juſtifie believers, *Rom.* 3. 25, 26. So it is matter of juſtice, to give, to ſo many as Chriſt hath ſatisfied for, that they may believe, *Phil.* 1. 29. *Others* by righteouſneſs underſtand the righteouſneſs of Jeſus Chriſt, who is here called our God, (where by the way this is an excellent teſtimony for the Deity of Chriſt, for it is not ſaid of God and *of*

our Saviour, but of God and our Saviour, there is but one ſingle article aſſigned to all the words, τῦ θεῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν χριστῦ; it is parallel to *Tit.* 2. 13.) Now faith is ſaid to be given through his righteouſneſs, ἐν, which may be taken either for διὰ, *per*, *propter*, *For*, and then the import is, that in conſideration of the ſatisfaction, merit, and righteouſneſs of Chriſt, God beſtows faith, and conſequently cannot without injuſtice but beſtow it upon ſuch, in reference to whom Chriſt hath bought, merited and purchaſed it; or it may be taken for σὺν or μετὰ, *cum*, *with*, and then the import is, that they had received faith, and with it the righteouſneſs of Chriſt made over and imputed to them. Now in my Sermon I took it as put for διὰ, and accordingly argued, and

Ἐν uſed often for διὰ: Mat. 6. 7. Mat. 11. 6. Act. 7. 29. 1 Cor. 12. 9. & alibi.

Ἐν for μετὰ Luk. 1. 26. Petrus hoc capite v. 5, 6, 7. voce ἐν pro σὺν ſepties utitur.

and I find no cauſe to recede from my perſwaſion.

But the Gentleman excepts, that this is to make that of Debt, which is meerly of Grace. P. 17.

To this I briefly Anſw. That it is both of Debt, and of Grace; of Debt in reſpect of Chriſt, of Grace in reſpect of us, and he muſt invent a new *Philoſophy*, as well as a new *Divinity*, before he can be able to prove theſe two to be contradictories. His other exceptions are obviated in the Expoſition, and indeed he wholly miſtakes the ſenſe in which I cited the words, and ſhews himſelf altogether ignorant of the ſcope of them.

We are now come to the Adverſaries laſt exceptions; *The firſt whereof is, that to ſay God would have a ſatisfaction, and yet that himſelf procured it,* P. 18.

is to render the whole transaction, a matter of Pageantry.

Answ. This is spoken to before, *p.* 152. & 197. and therefore I shall only say, that whatever it would be in *pecuniary debts*, it is not so in *pœnal*,

P. 19. *He adds secondly, That though according to this procedure, there would be mercy shewn to the sinner, yet there would be none shewn to sin.*

Answ. There neither ought nor can any mercy be shewn to sin: but is not this fine Divinity? that God must not only be a friend to the Rebell, but to the Rebellion? not only justifie the offender, but the offence? what is this but in plain English, sin must cease to be sin, or God must cease to be just and holy, otherwise he cannot be merciful. Are these the Masters of reason? or is this it they intend by the freenes

o

of Gods Grace in forgiveneſs? doth the Gentleman reproach us for *myſteries*? ſure this is *myſterie*, and myſterie of iniquity too. P. 19.

He hath one touch more upon the old ſtring at parting, namely, That it is unrighteous to puniſh an innocent in the room of the nocent. P. 19.

Anſw. Though this be fully Replyed to before, I ſhall yet further ſubjoyn this, namely, That by the common conſent of all Nations, in ſome caſes, the innocent may be made ſuffer in the room of the nocent; for example, ſuppoſe a perſon doth render himſelf a hoſtage, for the ſecurity of the faith of that ſtate where he is a member, (which he may do, in that a part oweth it ſelf, unto the preſervation of the whole) and that State whoſe fidelity he was bound

to

to ſecure, break their faith, nen
the Hoſtage though perſonal- He
ly innocent, being bound hat
to Anſwer for the guilt of bout
the State, may without any And
Unrighteouſneſs be put to hol
death. in,

I have gone now through And
the Pamphlet, and have not nd
omitted the leaſt thing that fen
is material, but whether o th
the Anſwers I have returned hole
be ſatisfactory, (I do not mean ruel
to the Adverſary, for I know ur r
that ſort of men too well, to onta
have cauſe to hope any ſuch be
thing of them) muſt be left to b
to the judgement of the Rea- alva
der to decide. I had thought ou
to have preſented the World, b
with ſome few of the many eac
unſavoury and blaſphemous ex- eſus
preſſions, which the book is tab
ſtuft with, but this diſcourſe the
being already ſwelled beyond
what I imagined, I ſhall only
mention

mention two or three. P. 12. *He tells us it is horrible cruelty that the punishment due to us should be inflicted upon Christ.* And in the same page, *That the whole transaction of a satisfaction, is Childish and Ludicrous.* And p. 14. *That the Phœnicians and Carthaginians in Sacrificing men (he should have added the Devil) in behalf of the whole people, came short of the cruelty of God in punishing Christ in our room.* And p. 15. *That it would grieve a man of ingenuity, to be saved at that rate*; i. e. less to be beholding to Christ for salvation. *Ex ungue Leonem.* you may know what the whole is, by a taste. That the great teacher of the truth, as it is in Jesus, would lead us into, and establish us in it, is and shall be the Prayer of the Author.

FINIS.

Reader, Besides several mistakes in the misplacing of Letters and Points, there are these which corrupt the sense, which, that neither thy self, nor the Author may be wronged, thou art desired to Correct.

PAg. 3. lin. 24. read *by it*. p. 5. l. 2. m. *judicare*. p. 8. l. 18. blot out *our*. p. 11. l. 17. r. *hence*. p. 14. l. 7. m. *justificatione*. p. 27. l. 21. r. *ἀγιάζειν which is equivalent to* τελειῶσαι. p. 37. l. 14. m. r. *aut*. p. 140. l. 8. r. *ἀνηνεγκεν*. p. 169. l. 3. add *the*. p. 224. l. 12. r. *disserve*. p. 224. l. ult. & pag. 225. l. 1. r. *unless* instead of *forasmuch*. p. 225. l. blot out *as*, ibid. after had, add *either had sin of his own, or had*. p. 226. l. 6. put *for*. p. 235. l. 13. r. *man*. p. 265. l. 16. add *the*. p. 267. l. 21. r. *instituted*. ibid. add (,) after Worship. p. 271. l. 12. add *it*.